

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 1021 - 84th Congress

Chapter 1030 - 2nd Session

H. R. 11833

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and Summary of H. R. 11833.....	1
Digest of Public Law 1021.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF PUBLIC LAW 1021

June 19, 1956	Rep. Hope introduced H. R. 11833 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill.
July 6, 1956	Committee ordered H. R. 11833 reported.
July 7, 1956	Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11833. Print of bill and report. House Report 2640.
July 23, 1956	House passed H. R. 11833 without amendment.
July 24, 1956	H. R. 11833 referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill.
July 25, 1956	Senate Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11833. Senate Report 2785. Print of bill and report.
July 26, 1956	Senate passed H. R. 11833 without amendment.
August 7, 1956	Approved: Public Law 1021.

House Agriculture Committee held hearings on June 28, 1956.

Extends the provisions of Public Law 566 to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Extends the benefits of these amendments to projects which the Secretary has previously become authorized to participate in the installation of works of improvement.

Provides that any watershed work plans with respect to which the Secretary has previously become authorized to participate in the installation of works of improvement or which have been previously approved by Congressional committees under Public Law 566, need not be resubmitted to the committees under the provisions of these amendments.

Public Law 1020 (H. R. 11742) HOUSING ACT OF 1956 (approved August 7, 1956). Amends and extends various housing laws. Amends the Housing Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of Treasury for the purpose of making loans for constructing or improving farm dwellings and other farm buildings. Limits the total principal amount of such notes and obligations which may be issued during the 5 year period ending June 30, 1961 to \$450 million. Amends the U. S. Housing Act of 1937 so as to authorize the Public Housing Administration to transfer, under certain conditions, farm-labor camps to local public housing agencies.

Public Law 1021 (H. R. 11833) GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM (approved August 7, 1956). Provides authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate a conservation program for the Great Plains area and to enter into ten-year contracts with farm and ranch operators under which producers would agree to a schedule of land-use adjustments and the necessary conservation measures which should be carried out in connection with these adjustments. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than Dec. 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colo., Kan., Mont., Nebr., N. Mex., N. Dak., Okla., S. Dak., Tex., and Wyo., designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. Authorizes the appropriation without fiscal year limitation of a maximum of \$150 million for the entire program exclusive of its administrative costs, but provides that not to exceed \$25 million may be expended on the program in any one year. Provides that funds made available for the program may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of the Act, and may be distributed among the States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of the Act. Provides that the program authorized shall be in addition to and not in substitution of other programs in the area. Amends section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, beginning with the 1957 wheat crop, to provide, under certain conditions, that if the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, the entire wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Public Law 1024 (S. 3275) FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956 (approved August 8, 1956). Establishes in the Interior Department the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife. Creates a Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department, consisting of two separate agencies to be known as the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife. Requires the transfer to Interior of all functions of the Agriculture Department and other agencies, as determined by the Budget Bureau to relate primarily to the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of commercial fisheries. Makes permanent the provision for transfer of certain section 32 funds from Agriculture to Interior, and provides that such sums shall be available until expended.

PRIVATE LAWS

Private Law 672 (H. R. 3964) KINGAN, INCORPORATED (approved May 28, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay \$13,095.82 to Kingan, Incorporated, of Richmond, Virginia, in full settlement for claims of the company against the U. S. for the destruction of swine infected and exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

Private Law 707 (H. R. 8041) CLYDE R. STEVENS (approved June 25, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay \$13,539.06 to Clyde R. Stevens, of San Antonio, Texas, in full settlement for his claims against the U. S. for the destruction of swine infected and exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

Private Law 719 (S. 3945) WALTER C. JORDAN AND ELTON W. JOHNSON (approved June 29, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$303 to Walter C. Jordan, of Pryor, Oklahoma, and \$67 to Elton W. Johnson, of Chelsea, Oklahoma, borrowers of the Farmers' Home Administration, for the replacement of two abstracts of title and duplicates of two mortgagee's title insurance policies which were destroyed in transit in the mails.

Private Law 802 (H. R. 10010) ROY CLICK AND CHARLIE GARDENER FORD (approved July 24, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay \$836 to Roy Click, of Wichita Falls, Texas, and \$566.12 to Charlie Gardener Ford, of Huntsville, Texas, in full settlement for their claims against the U. S. for the destruction of swine infected and exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

Private Law 803 (H. R. 10011) JESS GARY (approved July 24, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay \$3,398.14 to Jess Gary, of Wichita Falls, Texas, in full settlement for his claims against the U. S. for the destruction of swine infected and exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

Private Law 804 (H. R. 10199) A. O. NISSEN AND DON NISSEN (approved July 24, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay \$14,250.32 to A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen, San Antonio, Texas, in full settlement for their claims against the U. S. for the destruction of swine infected and exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

Private Law 805 (H. R. 11346) CAMILLUS BOTHWELL JETER (approved July 24, 1956). Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration therefor, to Camillus Bothwell Jeter, of Whitmire, South Carolina, all right, title, and interest of the U. S. to about 2.02 acres of national forest land, acquired by the U. S. by reason of a surveying error.

Private Law 833 (H. J. Res. 642) LAND TRANSFER TO HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB (approved August 1, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim about 3 acres of land to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Mississippi.

Private Law 857 (H. R. 3062) PAUL H. SARVIS (approved August 3, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$1,431 to Paul H. Sarvis, of Sylacauga, Alabama in full settlement for his claims against the U. S. for failure of the U. S. to pay the agreed purchase price under a purchase agreement for certain grass seed.

Private Law 873 (S. 2419) DR. ANTON M. LODMELL (approved August 6, 1956). Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$138.40 to Dr. Anton M. Lodmell, of Walla Walla, Washington, in full satisfaction of his claims against the U. S. for the use of his land by the Forest Service as a temporary road construction camp.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

ON
H. R. 11831 and H. R. 11833

JUNE 28, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture

Serial 000



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1956

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

GEORGE M. GRANT, Alabama

E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi

CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma

WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia

JAMES G. POLK, Ohio

CLARK W. THOMPSON, Texas

PAUL C. JONES, Missouri

JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky

HARLAN HAGEN, California

LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin

VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York

ROSS BASS, Tennessee

COYA KNUTSON, Minnesota

W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia

D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida

CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota

WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa

SID SIMPSON, Illinois

PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania

RALPH HARVEY, Indiana

HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota

PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma

CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine

WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, New York

KARL C. KING, Pennsylvania

ROBERT D. HARRISON, Nebraska

MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin

HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Utah

DELEGATES

E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska

MRS. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

Mrs. MABEL C. DOWNEY, *Clerk*

GEO. L. REID, Jr., *Assistant Clerk*

JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *Counsel*

FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Consultant*

CONTENTS

	Page
H. R. 11831. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.....	1
H. R. 11833. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.....	3
Statement of—	
Baker, John A., coordinator, legislative services, National Farmers Union.....	29
Peterson, E. L., Assistant Secretary; accompanied by F. G. Ritchie, Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Conservation Program Service; and D. A. Williams, Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture.....	5
Additional data submitted to the committee by—	
National Farmers Union:	
Letter of June 23, 1956, from W. L. Gooding, Modoc, Kans., enclosing news article from Hutchinson News-Herald, Hutchinson, Kans.....	34

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1956

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a. m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. Harold D. Cooley (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please come to order.

Mr. Peterson, we are delighted to have you with us this morning and we regret that some of our members are tardy but I suppose they will be here soon. You may proceed now with your statement, if you desire to do so.

(H. R. 11831 and H. R. 11833 are as follows:)

[H. R. 11831, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "SEC. 16", and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changes systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received

thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract; and

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof.

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340) (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage.

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including Soil Conservation Districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation; and

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act.

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

[H. R. 11833, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "SEC. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program. In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including Soil Conservation Districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage

amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

STATEMENT OF E. L. PETERSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, ACCOMPANIED BY F. G. RITCHIE, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE; AND D. A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, the statement attempts to give the background to the Great Plains problem, to depict some of the things that we are attempting to do under existing authorities in the Great Plains and then touches upon the legislation which the committee has before it for consideration.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to present information about amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 that provide for furthering a conservation program in the Great Plains.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 11, 1956, sent a message to both Houses of the Congress calling attention to the special problems that have long existed throughout the Great Plains region. He urged the Congress to consider and act on these problems during this session.

I quote from the President's message:

~ The Great Plains region, a vast agricultural empire peopled by 17 million of our citizens, is an area of severe climatic variations which periodically produce widespread suffering and heavy economic losses.

In this region farm families have a continuous struggle to protect their best cultivated and grazing lands against soil erosion during seasons of high winds and frequent periods of extremely dry weather.

Some of the most critical problems of the area are the outgrowth of war when farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains States patriotically and energetically responded to their Government's call for greatly increased production to meet wartime demands by converting grasslands to cultivation.

Because these problems directly concern the lives and prosperity of millions of American citizens, the Nation as a whole is directly concerned. Because all Americans are concerned with the maintenance and improvement of our soil and water resources, every citizen in the land has an interest in the solution of agricultural difficulties in the vast Great Plains areas.

Those early travelers who ventured across the plains called it an ocean of lush grass if their trip was during wet periods, but it was labeled "The Great American Desert" on maps of the region made before 1860.

A prolonged drought occurred in the southern plains in the early 1890's. Some of the early settlers left the region at that time. Another long drought began in 1910 and lasted through 1913 over most of the plains.

The drought of the thirties during which the area became known as the Dust Bowl persisted for 7 years in the southern plains and for 5 years in the northern plains. Most of you are familiar with the fact that thousands of farmers abandoned their farms and left the plains

during this period. Rainfall was normal or above from 1940 through 1949.

Many new settlers came to the Great Plains in the 1940's, some to occupy farms that had been abandoned in the 1930's. They plowed up some 4 million acres of the remaining grasslands. Most of this plow-up was in the southern plains. The farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains States responded splendidly to the call of their Government for greatly increased production during World War II.

This region is now suffering some of the results of continuing in effect wartime production incentives long after the emergency demand has ended.

The present drought returned to the southern plains in the early 1950's. In 1952 it had spread to all the plains region. Over most of the northern plains the drought lasted only 1 year. But it has persisted in the southern plains.

According to local estimates nearly 16 million acres of land were damaged by wind erosion in the spring and early summer of 1955, and about 10 million acres have been damaged during the same period this year. It is reported that eastern Colorado has the poorest wheat crop of recent years. It is less than half of the average for the past 10 years.

In February 1954 the Department of Agriculture began intensive studies of the damage from drought in the southern plains. This study which as it developed became cooperative with the Great Plains Council led to the development of a program for the Great Plains (USDA Miscellaneous Publication No. 709, January 1956).

Early in the 1930's a soil conservation project was established near Dalhart, Tex., to determine what practices and measures might be applicable in proper use and management of land, to holding the soil in place, and to demonstrate to farmers how these measures could be applied.

In 1938, farmers and ranchers started to organize soil-conservation districts to cope with the problem. There are nearly 200 districts organized and in operation in the wind-erosion area of the Great Plains now.

More than half of the farmers and ranchers in this area are cooperators with their soil-conservation district. With assistance from the agricultural conservation program farmers and ranchers have treated 12 percent of the cropland and 22 percent of the rangeland in the affected area.

A phase of Federal assistance in the Great Plains during the 1930's was the land utilization program. Projects established under that program involved the purchase of 1,100,000 acres of private land, almost all of which has since been converted to grazing land. These projects are now managed by the Forest Service.

Estimates made from scattered soil surveys indicate that not quite one-third of the affected area in the southern plains is suitable for continuous cropping under proper management.

Unfortunately, there is somewhere between 11 and 14 million acres now being cultivated that should not be. This is the land on which wheat and cotton crops have failed year after year and, even in favorable seasons, seldom makes satisfactory yields. This acreage constitutes one of the major problems of the area.

In addition to the problem of proper land use, flexible cropping systems are recommended for the area in order to take advantage of the

weather cycle. Stubble mulching and proper management of residues is needed in order to retain residues on the land.

Strip cropping is needed in most areas, and contouring and level terracing are recommended as water conservation measures. Good grass management to retain sufficient ground cover is needed on grazing lands. Also involved is sufficient water and salting places to permit even grazing. Contouring, water-spreading, and reseeding are needed on rangeland locally.

Another major problem is that of the size of both farm and ranch units. The units in the drier portions of the Great Plains should include sufficient acreage of cropland, at least 300 or more acres, so as to be efficient from the standpoint of in-puts of labor, machinery, and equipment. Experience has indicated that ranches of less than 125 animal units are seldom successful. Provision needs to be made for at least a 2-year forage supply to be continuously on hand.

A short-term or emergency program for plowing cropland has been in effect for the last two seasons. This program is directed toward (a) emergency tillage, and (b) establishing emergency cover.

It is estimated that nearly 10 million acres were chiseled or listed by farmers this spring. Some of these fields were tilled twice or three times to protect the soil from blowing.

However, such tillage has been effective in achieving only partial stabilization. Emergency cover of some kind should be established at the first opportunity on blowing fields, that is, as soon as enough rainfall comes to permit growing of cover crops.

The objective of the program: The goal to be achieved is a more stable agriculture, more dependable sources of income, and progressively satisfactory livelihood for the people of the region.

To achieve this goal, there must be widespread use of good soil management and water conservation practices and adjustments in sizes and types of farms which will enable farmers and ranchers to effectively cope with the climatic hazards of the region.

There must also be complete understanding of the objective and coordinated teamwork on the part of all concerned, farmers, land-owners, civic and agricultural groups, private industry, local, State, and Federal agencies and governments, in order to translate this program into action to create a more stable economy and for maximum benefits to all the residents of the Great Plains.

The following actions have been taken by the United States Department of Agriculture to assist farm and ranch operators of the region in the solution of their problems.

1. Land classification intensified: The Soil Conservation Service has moved ahead its soil survey work to be able to make available, farm by farm, this basic information for the proper use and management of the land in the Great Plains. This survey work is being concentrated first on the remainder of the cropland in the critical wind erosion areas.

This inventory of the soil will provide a basis for the land capability classification, which is a very useful tool in making adjustments for a more stable agriculture.

Additional experienced personnel have been added to the present staff to complete the survey in the critical wind erosion areas of the Great Plains area as rapidly as possible.

2. Technical assistance for conservation measures: The program of on-the-farm technical assistance in soil and water conservation is

being accelerated by the Soil Conservation Service. Additional technicians are being provided in those districts of the Great Plains where farmers and ranchers have made requests, and where such help is necessary to accelerate other State and Federal programs.

3. Cost sharing for conservation: The policy of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service continues to be one of sharing with farmers and ranchers the cost of installing and establishing those practices which are most enduring and most needed but which are not now a part of their normal farm and ranch operations.

The ACP cost-sharing program on those practices that are intended to bring about those land use adjustments required for a long-range program are being accelerated and rates of payment have been made more flexible.

4. Credit for the area: Private and cooperative lenders, historically the chief sources of agricultural credit will continue to be encouraged to provide maximum sound credit assistance to the majority of farmers, ranchers, and their cooperative organizations.

A review of the need for and the possibility of modifying regulations, supervisory requirements, and Federal banking laws to enable bankers to meet the problem of carrying good risks through an emergency period such as a drought disaster and making more intermediate term loans, is now in progress.

All lenders, cooperative, private, and Government, should take into consideration, in their credit policies, proper land use and sound management practices, as well as the size and type of the operation.

All lenders are being encouraged to meet the need for intermediate- and long-term credit to permit the enlargement and adaptation of farm units that are now too small or improperly organized to make the best use of resources.

5. Credit program of Farmers' Home Administration: The Farmers' Home Administration has developed and placed in operation in a great many counties a credit program designed especially for land-owners and operators. In substance, its provisions are as follows:

(a) Loans for reseeding and the establishment of grasslands and other approved conservation and land use practices.

(b) Loans for soil and water erosion control measures.

(c) Loans for the improvement and development of domestic and irrigation water supplies, for the repair and improvement of existing farm buildings, and for the purchase of such additional land as may be necessary to enlarge a farm into a family-type size unit.

(d) Loans for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, feed for livestock, insecticides, farm supplies, and for farm equipment repairs, the payment of interest, insurance, and taxes, including the refinancing of existing chattel debts, where necessary.

(e) Assistance to both creditors and debtors in effecting voluntary debt adjustments so that the debt load on the farmer or rancher will be held to a point within his ability to repay.

(f) Loans are predicated on farming operations that are consistent with recommended land use and farm management practices for the area.

(g) Terms in all instances are geared to the expected repayment ability of the borrower.

Additional field personnel have been added to the staff of the Great Plains region to assure proper attention to the making and servicing

of these and other loans handled by the Farmers' Home Administration.

This new special loan program supplements the regular programs of the agency and the credit now available from private, cooperative, and other Government sources.

Loans are made only to farmers and ranchers who are unable to obtain necessary credit at reasonable rates and terms from other lenders.

6. Federal crop insurance strengthened: Crop insurance is being further developed and strengthened to eventually serve as a major protective measure against crop losses in all areas suitable for arable farming. It may be necessary to extend the contract of insurance over more than one crop year in order to equalize premiums and losses. Standards of performance in carrying out risk-reducing practices are required in the insurance contract.

Changes are being developed in the contract provisions for the wind erosion counties designed to encourage insured farmers to plant cover crops early and to refrain from summer fallowing the same land more than one year when the winter wheat crop is lost early in the season.

Crop insurance is not available on land unsuited for the long-time production of the insured crop. Crop insurance must eventually operate on a sound actuarial basis. In the interest of developing and maintaining a sound insurance program, local leaders and agencies are being encouraged to assist the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in screening out land use and farming practices which should not be insured, and to determine if there are farming practices which should be an eligibility requirement.

When crop insurance is available, farmers are encouraged to join in building a sound and lasting crop-insurance program to stabilize the agricultural economy of the individual and the area. All Department agencies have been instructed to encourage eligible producers to carry crop insurance.

7. Weather reports and research: There is great need for determining the incidence and range of weather variation and its relationship to crop yields, and the mapping of climatic patterns by major climatic and soil areas of the plains as a means of clarifying weather risk.

The Weather Bureau and the Department have developed additional types of weather research which will achieve this result. Arrangements are being made for cooperative weather projects with land-grant colleges in the region.

8. Research: In order to provide a continuing basis for intelligent action on problems facing farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains, an expanded, sustained, cooperative, and coordinated program of research is being developed and will be vigorously conducted by the Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with State experiment stations.

Arrangements are being made through the Great Plains Agricultural Council to inventory and summarize the results of research which are now available. Full use will be made of available research in the guidance of this program.

In the areas which are physically adapted for continuous crop production, further research will be directed toward controlling wind and

water erosion and improving the soil, crop yields, livestock production, and the income expectancy, and toward the creation of cash and commodity reserves which are essential to carry farmers and ranchers through any drought years.

In the areas with soil which is not suitable for arable farming, intensified research is being inaugurated to guide an orderly and economically sound transition into grazing and livestock, and to prevent a recurrence of the distress caused by the cultivation of unsuitable land in high rainfall years.

Research is being intensified to determine methods and costs of establishing a satisfactory stand and growth of grass and the rate of stocking on regrassed lands.

Farm and ranch marketing and production supply procurement problems, that will grow out of the proposed land-use adjustments, are being given consideration and study.

9. Extension education: Following the initiation of the Great Plains program, the stepped-up work of Extension has reached varying degrees of intensity in the 10 States.

In Montana, Extension has expanded its program in range management and is working closely with soil conservation districts and the agricultural conservation program on soil and water conservation.

Nebraska has employed one full-time man on wind erosion problems who is conducting demonstrations with stubble mulch for erosion control. In Colorado, the program projection effort is concentrated in the 17 southeastern counties where the wind erosion problem is most severe.

Farm and home development work in these same 17 counties is already resulting in significant production adjustments on many farm and ranch units. Oklahoma and Texas have likewise made special efforts in stepping up their longtime planning in the Great Plains areas.

In North Dakota the emphasis has been on soil surveys, soil testing, soil and water seminars and irrigation. Most of the States have held statewide meetings of all the agencies to discuss the problems of the region.

The Great Plains film project has underway seven films applicable to wind erosion areas and part of these films will be available early next year.

Some of the most intensive work has been done in Kansas where two full-time men were employed in 1955 to work with the 31 counties in the western part of the State. In February of 1956, with the initiation of the State committee of agricultural agencies, two meetings were held in that area, which were attended by county delegates of State agencies, farm organization leaders, and county planning committees of farmers.

Each county was presented a table of 25-year trends in land use, size of farms, incomes, type of farming, tenure and wheat abandonment and crop yields. They were also presented results of the 1936-40 land use planning tables for each county, together with 1954 land use.

The county farmer committees were asked to discuss problems now facing them; what has been the contribution of price supports and wheat allotments to the changes; what changes in allotments and price support programs would contribute to stability; what land use adjustments are now needed.

Adjustments suggested by county committees involved a net reduction of 206,000 acres of wheat, a larger reduction in grain sorghums (below 1954) and 1,034,000 acres to be returned to grass.

A summary of the county committee meeting reports was presented and the group discussed their problems under six hearings: (1) Land use, (2) Wheat problems, (3) Livestock and feed reserves, (4) Erosion, (5) Fluctuating income and credit, and (6) New proposals.

Typical of the new proposals made is—

Locally administered regulations on hazardous farming operations are needed. Those farming practices that contribute to wind erosion are a community problem as well as an individual problem.

The penalties for following such practices should include the loss of ASC benefits administered by and subject to the discretion of local county committees. It was recommended that wind erosion payments be directed at encouraging preventative wind erosion practices or measures (cover crops, water conservation measures, etc.) rather than operated on an emergency basis.

In county meetings some decision were made for positive action in 1956. Where items of emphasis were agreed upon, the responsibility of each agency in the county was spelled out and they are all now engaged in trying to make their maximum contribution under present programs.

The Federal Extension Service is continuing to assist land-grant colleges and their extension services in further strengthening their educational programs by placing special emphasis on practical ways and means of making major adjustments in land use and good farm and ranch management to better assure a stable agricultural economy over a sustained period.

Landowners and operators and local leaders: The ownership and operation of land carries with it the primary responsibility for maintaining its productive capacity by following proper land-use practices.

Landowners and operators are responsible, especially when using publicly supported programs or facilities, to so apply their benefits as to preserve and enhance the value of their land.

They should also assume the responsibility for participating in, and contributing to, the formation and development of policies and programs which are adapted to the needs of their area.

Civic, farm, and business interests in the area should assume local leadership. To be successful, any program will require recognition of problems locally, and a willingness on the part of all concerned to accept their share of the responsibility and leadership for the solution of the problem.

The provisions of the bill involve a contract between the producer and the Secretary of Agriculture. Some protection is afforded to the Government in that the producer must develop and agree to a conservation plan and that he forfeits all rights to payments or grants and must refund to the United States upon his violation of the contract.

However, to be successful the Great Plains program will require recognition of problems locally and at the State level and a willingness on the part of all concerned to accept their full share of the responsibility and leadership for the solution of the problem.

County governments can help in such activities as land classification, tax adjustment procedures and stimulating community action. State governments can facilitate the program by assuming the responsibility for meeting the problems of proper land use; providing funds for research, education, regulatory, and action programs needed

to assist landowners and operators in achieving recognized standards of proper land use; by reviewing water resource programs in their State and by the enactment of legislation for the implementation of these and other segments of needed programs.

Most of the programs which have been described have been put into operation by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture under existing authority. However, because of the nature of the problem some additional authority is now requested. It pertains primarily to helping a farmer or rancher to complete the application of a conservation plan once he has agreed to it.

The bills now under consideration would accomplish the purpose of assuring the producers in the area of continuing assistance over a period of years. This will enable them to install the conservation measures and make the changes in land use which they agree are needed for their farm unit. This program would be in addition to other programs offered by the Department to the farm and ranch operators in the area.

The agricultural conservation program is an annual offer to farmers and ranchers to "practice" by "practice." Under it costs are shared with the producers who carry out certain conservation measures to the extent which they are able with their own financial resources plus the cost-shares offered under the ACP, augmented by the technical, educational, and research efforts of the departmental agencies.

The recently enacted soil-bank program will likewise be available to farm and ranch operators in the area. This is essentially a device to adjust production of surplus crops to effective demand. It approaches the problem "commodity" by "commodity."

Naturally we expect certain conservation measures to be carried out under the "acreage reserve." We also anticipate substantial conservation accomplishments under the "conservation reserve" phase of the program.

However, that is not the main purpose of the soil bank legislation. It is directed more toward immediate shifts in land use rather than those to be made under a long-range program such as provided in the legislation under consideration here.

Under the program proposed in this legislation the conservation problem would be taken up for a farm or ranch in its entirety. A long-time program of conservation and land use adjustment would be worked out with the producer in accordance with the capabilities of each farm or ranch.

This would include a schedule of land use adjustments and conservation measures considered essential for the most efficient operation of the farm or ranch unit. Assistance would be given for the installation of the necessary conservation measures.

Under the terms of the long-time contract proposed the operators would be assured of continuing assistance as they move forward in the installation or inauguration of the various segments of the plan developed for their operating unit.

In the 10 Great Plains States there are estimated to be between 11 and 14 million acres of cropland in the area unsuited for continuous crop production which should be seeded to permanent vegetative cover.

The Department has estimated that approximately 10 million acres of this erosive land would eventually come under the terms of

this program. On the basis of sharing 80 percent of the cost of seeding it has been estimated that program costs of about \$112 million would be incurred for this purpose.

We have also estimated that about 6 million acres of rangeland needs to be reseeded. On the same basis of cost sharing we have estimated a program cost of \$30 million. Related conservation range practices such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed on the area shifted into grazing use. We estimated the cost of these facilitating measures at about \$8 million.

The amendment proposed to section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, would maintain the wheat history on the farms and ranches participating in the program. It is essentially the same provision as that contained in section 307 of the Soil Bank Act except that it would continue for the life of the contract and will serve the same purpose—that is give farmers more assurance that their acreage allotments will be protected while the land use adjustments are being made.

All agencies of the Department will continue to work at the problems in the Great Plains under their existing authorities. Projects will be carried out on farms and ranches moving as fast and as far as the operators are able to do with their own financial resources.

Because of the nature of the problem in the Great Plains area we, in the Department, feel that to adequately meet the situation a long-term approach must be taken and assurance of continuing assistance be offered if the desired accomplishments are to be achieved.

In order to fully implement a long-range program we need authority for long-term commitments on ACP cost-sharing which these bills would provide.

We will appreciate your favorable action on the proposed legislation. Thank you.

I have with me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, representatives of our Soil Conservation Service, our Agricultural Conservation Program Service, and our Agriculture Research Service, in order that we may attempt to develop as fully as possible the questions that you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Peterson, for your statement.

Would you point out now just what these bills would do, that you cannot now do under existing legislation, including the recent soil-bank bill?

I know they provide that you may make long-term contracts but you do have that authority under the soil bank program.

Mr. PETERSON. Under the soil bank program, that is correct.

I will try to explain the essential differences as we see them between the program that is here proposed and the authorities that we now have, including the soil bank legislation.

Under the soil bank legislation a farmer is authorized to put any cropland which he desires into the soil bank program. He does that by signing a contract with the Department of Agriculture, under the terms of which he gets payment for the transition from crop to cover. He gets his annual rental payment for payment in lieu of the moneys which he would have received had the land remained in crop.

Under the program that is here proposed, the obligation upon the farmer is not entirely of his choice, that is, he cannot say, "I will take

this acreage, this cropland, and put it in the soil bank and get payment."

Under the program we are proposing to you here the first thing that would be done is that a survey would be made of the farm to determine the capability of the land in the farm. A comprehensive review of the present farming pattern in relation to the problems of erosion and the capability of the land would be made.

In consultation with the farmer, a conservation farming program for the entire farm, all of the acreage on it, would be developed.

If the farmer wished to adjust his existing farming pattern to fit a conservation farming pattern for his entire farm, all of the acreage on it, he could then, under the terms of the legislation being proposed, enter into a contract with the Secretary, pursuant to which the Secretary would share with him the cost of making those adjustments to put his entire farm into a conservation farming operation.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, under the soil bank legislation it is not contemplated that the contract will deal with the entire farm, but with only a part of the farm which the farmer himself desires to put into the bank and which the Secretary agrees to accept into the bank?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And a pattern that fits into the whole area?

Mr. PETERSON. The whole farm, farm by farm. This is not intended, of course, to be a compulsory program in any sense.

The CHAIRMAN. I know. What are the other points that this bill offers?

Mr. PETERSON. That is the essential proposition that is laid before you in this legislation, Mr. Chairman, an opportunity is afforded in this particular area to develop farm by farm as farmers wish to, a conservation farming pattern. In order to make the shifts necessary to put that pattern into effect a contract cost-sharing arrangement over a period of years during which period the farmer could take the steps necessary to bring about the shift in his farming pattern, in his production pattern, is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank and congratulate you for the splendid statement you have presented to the committee. Especially for having referred to the programs already now available which are the soil conservation program, the ACP program, the crop insurance program, the technical assistance conservation measures, credit facilities that are made available to the farmers by the Farmers Home Administration, weather reports and research, and all of these other items that you have mentioned, including the extension service.

I think that when people talk about the farm program they seem to restrict their thinking to 2 or 3 things:

One is, of course, primarily the price support program. We have a lot of controversy about that. People lose sight of the fact that the farm program is a program of many vital parts, many of which you have mentioned in this statement.

When we talk about helping the little farmer, we have done everything for the little farmer that we have done for the big farmer. The little farmer can participate in all of these numerous programs.

I want to congratulate you, as I say, for having mentioned these various programs that have been provided through the years for all of our farmers, big and small.

Mr. King wants to ask you a question.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Peterson, are you not here making a rather lengthy plea for the support by Government money of something which has no economic justification in accordance with your own statement in the early part of it?

Mr. PETERSON. No; I would not agree with that, Mr. King.

Mr. KING. Why then do you say there are some millions of acres out here that should never have been plowed up and now should go out of cropland, if there is any economic justification for its continued existence?

Mr. PETERSON. That is exactly what we are trying to do, to offer a program pursuant to which this land may be brought into use in accordance with its capabilities.

As long as the land is used outside of its capability and we spend money, as we do year after year, for emergency tillage payments and other kinds of payments, it has seemed to us that we are merely treating a symptom rather than to get at a basic cause.

During the war, as I attempted to indicate, the emphasis was, of course, on all-out production. Much of the land was plowed up during that period; some after the war. Capitalizations were built in the land on the basis of crop production. Much of those capitalizations will ultimately, if the land is to be properly used, be wiped out.

I see no means by which that can be avoided.

When a farmer takes care of his land, as many of them do in the area, the farmers who were there during the 1930's and learned to live with the climatic variations, are doing a pretty good job through their soil conservation districts and other types of local arrangements of conducting their farming operations, but alongside of them is the man who may not be doing that who needs to bring about a change in his land pattern, then the careful farmer is handicapped. The land not being taken care of—and I have seen much of it under these wind-erosion conditions—begins to drift with the wind and go over and damage his neighbor. His neighbor can't prevent it. And as a result the whole community is damaged.

My own view is that we cannot have effective conservation or care of land unless there is understanding and conviction in the minds of the landowner that doing these things is good for him and in his interest, and that is the setting in which we have tried to present and carry forth this whole Great Plains program, working with local people, and their local organizations, to bring about a local understanding and to present to them governmental aid insofar as it is available to accomplish their own local objectives.

Mr. KING. Are you trying to rescue land or people?

Mr. PETERSON. People are the important consideration in this matter, Mr. King. As I see it, at least, these people depend upon the land for their livelihood. And if their land is destroyed, of course, their livelihood is destroyed with it.

Mr. KING. You think that they broke up all of this land out there in the West, or a great part of it, through patriotism?

I noticed you referred to that.

Mr. PETERSON. That was partly true. Farmers are patriotic, very much so. I think, also, there was the fact that during the period of the 1940's, moisture conditions were very good and there was opportunity to make money in cropping that land. Money was made in cropping—very substantial amounts of money.

Mr. KING. Well, I just want to say, I am a little cynical about the influence of patriotism in the matter because with Government price supports and good marketing at the time they went into it mainly to make money.

Mr. PETERSON. I think that took place to some degree.

Mr. KING. No more patriotism involved in it than in the city where an employee got the best paying job that he could get.

The CHAIRMAN. Aside from patriotism, the fact is that the Nation has an interest in all of this wide area that you have referred to and we do not want it to blow away again. We want to put it back into grass. That is what you contemplate doing, isn't it?

Mr. KING. Abandonment, of course, is one of the best ways in the world to conserve soil. Let me show you what you are proposing to do here.

With 11 million acres of this that you say should go out of crops, you are proposing to pay through these various schemes of soil conservation, probably, more than the land is worth or would sell for on the market.

Why don't you be realistic and put less than that total amount of money in Government purchases of land and simply abandon it, so far as all crop use is concerned?

You propose here \$110 million to take 11 million acres out of production. That is your initial cost here, as you say, of doing it.

Do you think that the holders of that land could sell it on the market for \$10 an acre today?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes; I think they could sell the bulk of that land in excess of that price today. I am not intimately informed about land values, generally, but I think the land is worth more than that.

Let me say further, that if, as you suggest, that land were to be abandoned, left in its present state, and if the weather conditions obtain as they have the past immediate years, that land would become damaged almost beyond any repair, or at least repair would cost substantially greater amounts than are being here proposed.

Mr. KING. I grew up in the Dust Bowl. I am not ignorant of conditions out there. And if you have so little rain that weeds and natural cover will not hold it, you have got too little rain to consummate any soil conservation practices, too. You must remember that.

Mr. PETERSON. That is very true, sir.

Mr. KING. Therefore, I do believe that one of the best ways in the world to conserve the soil for the next generation is to abandon it—let it grow up in weeds.

If you say you are going to pay for the establishment of grass cover on that land and then you are going to rent it for the Government, it will cost you what? At least, \$18 an acre to establish the grass cover. And you are going to pay them what? \$5 an acre a year. You are getting way over the market for the land in the area where you say these 11 million acres exist. That is, the desert conditions out in the Midwest.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I would hardly characterize it as desert, Mr. King. People are living on that land—owning it. They have at times had very satisfactory returns from that land. Under favorable moisture conditions it is quite a productive area, speaking of it generally.

Mr. KING. But favorable moisture conditions are not normal there?

Mr. PETERSON. No. The moisture conditions, as I attempted to point out, are variable. They go up and down. It can be farmed very satisfactorily.

Mr. KING. They make a good crop when they have the maximum and not the normal moisture out there. The early speculators who went out there figure if they got 2 crops out of 5 they were doing fine. They knew what they were doing.

Today, however, they subsist mainly by Government aid and Government subsidy which is costing the Government more than it would cost the Government to buy the land.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield there? What subsidy are these people receiving?

Mr. KING. What do they get under the drought relief bill? What do they get under the soil conservation practices? There are a dozen different ways that they get subsidies for existence. And now we are proposing even more of them.

Mr. KING. There is no justification for it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you regard the ACP program in the nature of a subsidy?

Mr. KING. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The farmer has to put something into it himself, you know.

Mr. KING. The Government reimburses him.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are complaining about drought, what about flood relief and all other natural disasters in which the Government comes to the relief of citizens in distress?

Mr. KING. Just to what extent?

The CHAIRMAN. To what extent?

Mr. KING. To what extent? Maybe I missed something.

The CHAIRMAN. Millions of dollars. The cattle people in distress, not by natural catastrophe or disaster, but we spent about \$250 million to relieve the financial and economic distress of cattle producers.

Year after year we spend tens of millions of dollars on floods, and droughts and all of that, but I do not see why you should complain.

Mr. KING. Last summer I lost 500 acres of vegetables through the flood. I didn't know there was any way for me to get a dime out of the Government for that.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not think you would take it.

Mr. KING. You do not know me, I will take anything I can get when the Government starts passing the gravy.

Mr. DIXON. I compliment the gentlemen, Mr. Peterson, on this most effective statement. Also, upon the general purposes of the measure. And I support those general purposes.

I can, however, hear quite a general cry from our stock people unless some assurances are given us.

And now I'd like to refer to the paragraph at the bottom of page 10. Maybe the assurances can come under this section. The bottom paragraph:

In the areas with soil which is not suitable for arable farming, intensified research is being inaugurated to guide an orderly and economically sound transition into grazing and livestock.

That indicates greater production of livestock on lands that are used by the Government or assisted by the Government for restoration purposes.

I would like to ask you, first, would you permit grazing on these lands before supply and demand and prices are brought into line in the cattle industry?

I believe that our cattle people are receiving just slightly over 60 percent of parity now.

Mr. PETERSON. I should say this, Mr. Dixon, that the farmers and ranchers who own this land have to have a livelihood from that land. The problem is to get the land in a pattern of production that will protect the land, will maintain its physical structure, will prevent it from blowing away and damaging not only their neighbors' but water courses, reservoirs, and all of the other community benefits that there are.

I know of no way that those people can get a livelihood from that land unless they can use it. If they are prevented from using it for its adapted purposes, obviously, they cannot get a livelihood from it.

And I would not envision preventing them from using it for grazing purposes for the production of livestock.

In the southern plains, particularly, I am informed that it takes from 3 to 5 years, in some cases longer, to get a stand of grass that can be grazed and used.

And the carrying capacity even under good conditions is relatively limited.

My own view is that the land when it does produce grain will produce much more meat, which is the final product with which livestock producers are concerned, than the land will in grass.

I think, by and large, the livestock industry has not been helped by the depressant influence upon feed-grain prices resulting from the buildup in feed-grain stocks.

As a livestock man, I would be much more concerned with the buildup in feed-grain stocks and the depressing influence that buildup has upon the price of feed grains than I would upon land and grass.

Mr. HOPE. Will you yield?

Mr. DIXON. I do.

Mr. HOPE. I think it should be pointed out that to put this land back into grass and into livestock production, you are, of course, putting it back in the shape that it was before it was put into crop production.

In other words, you are not bringing new land that was never in livestock production into that type of farming. You are just putting it back into the type of agriculture that was originally there.

And furthermore, I do not believe my friend from Utah is in a very good position to raise any question of that kind when we just voted a \$730 million project here a while ago, the upper Colorado project, to greatly expand livestock production in his area. Am I not correct?

Mr. DIXON. I would like to answer that.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to have you.

Mr. DIXON. If we did in this the same as we did in that bill, we would be very happy. We put an amendment in the upper Colorado project bill that there be no additional land go into crops, that are under price support, for the next 10 years.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. To the extent this program is carried out, we will do exactly what the gentleman says he has in the upper Colorado. We will take it out of price-supported crops and put it into non-price-supported crops.

Mr. DIXON. There are only 135,000 new acres of land being brought into cultivation through that project. This would bring in 10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about the degree.

Mr. HOPE. You might produce more on those 135,000 under irrigation than from the 11 million.

Mr. DIXON. I doubt that very seriously.

Mr. HOPE. I do not doubt it at all. It will produce more on the 135,000 irrigated acres, than would be produced on all of the land that would go into grass. Of course, all of these 11 million acres will not go into grass.

Mr. DIXON. There will not be more livestock. It will be sugar beets. There will be poultry. There will be all kinds of diversified crops.

Mr. HOPE. It would not result in the increased production of commodities that are already in surplus.

Mr. DIXON. 135,000 acres would not be 135,000 acres devoted to forage. While much of this 10 million acres would be.

Since it is a question of degree, why it is all in favor of the Colorado project not creating anything like the surplus of red meat that this would.

Mr. HOPE. If the upper Colorado project will not produce any more than you say, how can you justify the tremendous expenditure that the taxpayers will have to pay to bring that land into cultivation?

Mr. DIXON. The supplying of hundreds of communities with culinary water, so that they can live; the supplying of industry with both power and water, so that they won't have to export our young people out of the State in order to earn a living, and many other reasons.

Mr. HOPE. If the Great Plains are taken care of, we will not have to export people, either.

Mr. DIXON. I yield to Mr. Jennings.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I get it, you are worried about bringing in at Government expense additional acreage that will promote the increased livestock production; is that correct?

Mr. DIXON. While the livestock prices are so depressed.

Mr. JENNINGS. They are about 60 or 70 percent of parity.

Mr. DIXON. If they would defer that until livestock prices were more favorable, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. He said it would take about 2 or 3 years to get going.

Mr. JENNINGS. This is privately owned land; is it not?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JENNINGS. They pay taxes on this land?

Mr. PETERSON. They do.

Mr. JENNINGS. During the time this is being brought back into soil conservation or grass or forest, or whatever they bring it back into?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. In carrying this on a little further, would it not be more practical to take out the land which the Government now owns and which is being leased to producers for the purpose of production of meat products which are in surplus?

Mr. PETERSON. An order has just been written within the Administration to prevent the leasing of Government land for the production of crops in surplus supply.

Mr. JENNINGS. Crops? In that administrative order is animals considered a crop?

Mr. PETERSON. No, sir. I might say this; as I pointed out, this is a long-term program. We do not know conclusively at this moment how or to what degree this program will be accepted.

We think it will have a reasonable amount of acceptance. Over time we think it will have rather a good acceptance.

The American consumers have indicated a preference for animal proteins. Our consumption has been moving upward constantly.

Mr. JENNINGS. But the price has been moving down constantly.

Mr. PETERSON. It has fluctuated. It has gone up and down over the years.

I was with friends, selling fat cattle on the market in 1938 for 8½ cents. They moved up close to 38 cents at the high point, or thereabouts.

Mr. DIXON. I would like to continue my questioning.

Mr. KING. Will you yield to me?

Mr. DIXON. I would like to continue for just a minute and then I shall be able to yield to my colleague.

You will recall that just 4 or 5 days ago I willingly accepted an amendment to this cash forest-purchase bill which will take that land out of grazing for all time.

So I want to show you that I am consistent.

Mr. JENNINGS. A wonderful gesture, and I want to commend you for that and hope it will be carried on further.

Mr. HOPE. How much land was involved?

Mr. DIXON. We cannot carry that so far as your idea is concerned. It would take all of the Forest Service land out of grazing, because our State is 72 percent public domain.

If you would take all of that out of production——

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not your State being subsidized by the Federal Government in that manner?

Mr. DIXON. Very little, if any.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let us take it out then.

Mr. DIXON. I think that our wealth is produced by money, materials, and men, and that men are just as important as the materials and the money, and that you cannot wipe out two-thirds of all of the farm homes in the State with one fell swoop.

Mr. JENNINGS. Do you not agree that that is a subsidy when the Government owns that land? There are no taxes being paid on it. And it is leased to individuals who are raising livestock in competition with my farmers and other farmers of this country, who are paying taxes and paying for these soil-conservation measures, that are being practiced. Is that not competition? Is that not subsidy?

Mr. DIXON. The Government gives them a very small subsidy. They pay rental for that land to the Government which goes to build reclamation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. How much, about 50 cents a day?

Mr. JENNINGS. How much does that rental average per acre?

Mr. DIXON. I am not certain. It is by the head. It is thirty-some-odd cents for sheep. And how much is it for cattle?

Mr. PETERSON. Thirty-five cents per head per month.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that it is being overgrazed to the detriment of the conservation of water and resources today?

Mr. DIXON. It is being. That is what we are fighting. On one county, Wasatch County, they have a notice to take 20 percent of their livestock off the range this year, 20 percent next year, and 20 percent the year after, to reduce the grazing.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean reducing?

Mr. DIXON. Yes. They are already suffering enough without eliminating two-thirds of the homes of the State in one fell swoop.

Mr. HOPE. Will you yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes. I promised Mr. King, if that is all right.

Mr. HOPE. On this point of whether your people are being subsidized or not in the livestock industry, how much did I understand you to say you pay for grazing per head?

Mr. DIXON. Thirty-five cents, I think, for sheep, and about 50 cents for cattle—that is a month.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HILL. How many months do you keep them up there? Some talk like you keep them up 14 months out of a year. How many months do you keep them up on the hillside?

Mr. DIXON. They used to keep them up there for 4 months. Now it is 3 months. On practically all of the forest, on each of it they have cut them to 2 months. They have just about cut their throats up there already.

Mr. HOPE. That is a small fraction of what we have to pay in Kansas per head for livestock pasture.

Mr. DIXON. I yield to Mr. King.

Mr. KING. You better yield to me so I can change the subject. I wanted to make one more point about your statement, Mr. Peterson.

I find in it one good idea that is very seldom expressed around here, that is the idea of penalties rather than subsidies as a means of accomplishing soil conservation. It is in your quotation on the bottom of page 11 of your statement.

Why couldn't we, instead of trying to buy compliance all of the time, set up control over bad practices, such as they do in cities, or suburban townships, with zoning ordinances?

Mr. PETERSON. That has been done.

Mr. KING. No subsidies involved in the application of zoning ordinances. They simply draw up prohibitions for certain practices; and certain things you cannot do.

A lot of things, a lot of soil could be saved if the farmer in the interest of all of the people of the country was subject to a fine for letting his land wash away or blow away. It would not be politically smart, of course, to advocate something like that, but that would be just as practical and less expensive for the taxpayer.

Mr. PETERSON. My own view is that that will be done increasingly over the country. It is being done now to some degree in some States.

But there again, that is a matter for local determination by the people who live in the communities and own their land. Most zoning legislation is State legislation, giving authority to subdivisions of State government to enact zoning ordinances and land-use ordinances and so forth.

Mr. KING. You would say then it is a good idea—only the Federal Government couldn't participate in anything like that?

Mr. PETERSON. I would not think it would be wise for the Federal Government to enter that field, Mr. King. I think that is a field that should be reserved to the States and local communities.

Mr. KING. We are already in the field, only we are attacking the problem reversely. We are in the field with all sorts of regulations, tied up with subsidies where we pay and then tell them what they must do.

Mr. PETERSON. That is very true. Where the Federal Government puts its money into a program or a project, obviously it must put the restrictions and the sideboards, so to speak, around that program.

Mr. KING. Suppose it is in the interest of all of the people, rather than just the individual recipient of the money. This could be the basis for the application of the zoning principle.

Mr. PETERSON. Any Federal program will apply equally to those affected by it, irrespective of where they are, on a national basis.

We are encouraging in this Great Plains program the local people in the States and in the counties to evaluate the possibility in the extension of the use of zoning legislation, but again, with the tremendous variation there is between communities, we think this is a subject matter that should be retained in State and local hands.

Mr. DIXON. I have one more question. I would like to say for the record that the livestock industry has suffered far more than any of the supported crops and it is receiving far less subsidy, as has been mentioned here, than any of our basic crops.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield?

You have had \$250 million in 1 year.

Mr. DIXON. I would like to ask the gentlemen a question further, because I have taken too much time now.

The CHAIRMAN. You made a statement and you want to leave it in the record. You never want to hear about the subsidies to the beef producers.

Mr. DIXON. I can support my statement that the livestock people have been the forgotten people when compared with the basic commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to debate that with you sometime.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is your contention whether they are on Government or privately owned land; is it not?

Mr. HILL. I have a question or two on the bill.

Mr. DIXON. I have a question of the witness, then I will give you the floor.

You have given us some hope there in the statement that it takes possibly 3 to 5 years to get sufficient cover crop on these eroded lands to support grazing?

Mr. PETERSON. That is the information I have.

Mr. DIXON. Is there any other assurances we can give our cattle people that this will not be just a measure to produce more cattle and further depress the price of livestock?

Mr. PETERSON. I do not think that assurance can be categorically given, sir.

As it has been pointed out, this program envisions as a part of its objectives, putting this land into the use from which it came. It was in grassland at one time, much of it.

I should say, also, that as to the acreage indicated, some of that acreage may be retained in crop under the proper conservation farming pattern, by the development of water-conservation measures, by certain cropping practices and so forth.

But that which after a soil survey is shown to be incapable of producing a crop on the basis of the average moisture, on the weather records in the region, obviously would have to go back into grass.

I do not think, in my own judgment, that you would anticipate a great increase in livestock production if all of this area went into grass. I say great increase percentagewise with respect to total.

And, certainly, you could not get that maximum increase, whatever it may be, short of, at the very quickest, 5 years. And I think 10 to 15 years would be a more reasonable expectation.

Mr. DIXON. You are doing just what I hoped you will do, to keep the plight of the livestock people in mind, especially while prices are so depressed.

Mr. PETERSON. We have been conscious of the problems of livestock producers. I know that they have problems all over the country, both in the West and in other livestock producing areas.

Mr. DIXON. I yield back.

Mr. HOPE. Wouldn't it be more correct to say in this instance that this is a move to stabilize the livestock industry rather than to expand the livestock industry? And when I say that I am thinking of the fact that as long as this land is in cultivation in a normal year or better than a normal year, you will produce a great deal more livestock on this land if it is in grain, such as milo or wheat or any grain that can be grown in that area or in forage or sorghum than you could possibly produce on it if you went back to native grasses or new grasses that might be developed.

Mr. PETERSON. I would agree with your statement, Mr. Hope, that this might better be expressed as a movement to stabilize the livestock industry rather than to expand it—stabilize it as to the area which would be affected by this program.

Mr. HOPE. You would have stability from year to year if it is in grass, whereas as long as it is in crops it will produce big crops some years.

When you have 2 or 3 good years there would be quite a stimulus to livestock production, quite an expansion, and then if you have some dry years, the whole thing will fall apart.

That, I think, is the most important thing, so far as the livestock industry is concerned. You want to add stability. Over a 10-year period you might not have so much production, however.

Mr. DIXON. Probably you are referring more to the fattening of the cattle than to the feeder livestock.

Mr. HOPE. There are not very many cattle fattened out there. However, if this land is used to produce grain, that grain, or a very large proportion of it—even wheat, in some instances—is going to be fed to livestock.

And the more grain you feed to livestock the more meat you are going to have.

So anything that will put this land back into grass will stabilize the livestock industry. But in my judgment, by producing less grain it will produce less meat in the final analysis.

I believe the gentleman's fears are groundless in this whole thing.

Mr. HILL. I want to ask a question right on what you are talking about doing.

No. 1 is this: Do I get this correct, that there are 17 million people that are already in this area and because of conditions that have existed

in the past, we have come to a point in that area—Colorado having 17 counties in it—where they are going to be compelled to abandon practically half of the dry area if this drought condition persists and it appears to continue.

Let me ask you this: These 17 million people in these 10 or 11 States—maybe there are not quite that many—can stay there if we start a program like this. And you are really helping those people. And what we are trying to do is to carry out a program in this whole High Plains area that will eventually wind up with farmers that can actually make a living in those particular areas in which they live and have a permanent income from the agricultural resources of the area. Is that not the point?

Mr. PETERSON. That is the basic objective, Mr. Hill.

Mr. HILL. And it is not a question of cattle or wheat, and it is not a question of any other type or kind of farming. It is a question of stabilizing the production in a way that it will become permanent; is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOPE. Right on that point—and I think it is applicable to the criticism Mr. King has made of the program—the thing to do in that area, as far as possible, is to keep the people on the land who are there now. They understand the conditions. This is the first time that some of these people have gone through a drought situation, because most of them came in after the drought of the 1930's.

There was an emigration out during the 1930's. These people came in the early 1940's, in many cases. They had a period of good years and good crops. And now they have gone through a period of poor years and poor crops. They have learned how to farm in that area. They are doing a farming job to the best advantage.

Of course, they are now in a situation where they need help. They need help in order to keep their heads above water, so far as making a living is concerned, but they also need help in bringing about the adjustment in land use that must be made if the area is to be used to the best advantage.

If you do nothing—I am speaking now of the whole program that you have described—if you did nothing during this period and there was an outward migration, then the time would come when there would surely be good seasons again at a time when we would need the production, and you would have an influx of new people who are totally unfamiliar with farming in that area, who would have to learn all over again the lesson that has been learned by the people who are there now.

Therefore, from every standpoint—from the human standpoint, the standpoint of better farming practices, and from the standpoint of the economy—it is better and sounder to leave these people on the land and enable them to make adjustments that have to be made than to have them leave and a new group of people come in and learn all over again. Because, as sure as we are sitting here, that will happen again. History shows that.

Mr. PETERSON. That has been the pattern over an extended period of time.

Mr. HILL. I have one more question.

Mr. HOPE. Let me point out, also, that during the period of the 1940's and early 1950's that land produced tremendous crops, not a

bushel of which was in surplus but used by ourselves, or our allies, or by undernourished people in wartorn countries.

No one can say what happened there during the 1940's was bad, that it was wrong. The land was used, perhaps, to the best advantage it could have been used at that time and all that was produced was needed.

As a matter of fact, this land has not contributed particularly to surpluses in the last 3 or 4 years because the crops have been very poor in that area.

To sum up I want to point out that the heavy production on this land was during the 1940's and early 1950's and did not create any surplus, because we had no surplus at that time.

Mr. HILL. That is right. It was all used in the war effort or in an effort to gain friends and assist in helping others.

The next thing Mr. Hope just touched, that is, you are going to work this program out cooperatively and voluntarily with the people who are already in this area; is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. We do not believe it can be done otherwise.

Mr. HILL. They are willing. Let us go one step further and state that the people that are in these areas are willing, they see the devastation all around them. And they are willing to cooperate with you in this broadening of this program of soil conservation and Farm Home Administration that you are willing to make at this time. You will have no trouble in securing cooperation in any of these areas?

Mr. PETERSON. I think that is the case. Obviously, as Mr. Hope pointed out a moment ago, there have been new people come into the area in the last 10 or 15 years who have not experienced drought conditions until this last most recent drought.

There is a good deal of educational work which needs to be done with many of the people. It is being done. The soil conservation districts have, I think, a higher degree of participation of the people in the area than in most other parts of the country.

I believe this program can be most useful to the soil conservation districts and through their cooperators and to extending the number of cooperators and bringing this program to bear upon the problem areas, the individual problem areas and ranches in the total area.

Mr. HILL. And one other thing I would like to add, is of the wonderful experimental work now being conducted at this present moment, developing grasses that will hold the soil as well as produce pasture. Undoubtedly, grass is the crop to protect the soil. You should be commended, and your department, for the fine work that has been going on in this regard.

There is no reason why we could not, in this program that you have outlined here, develop the grasses that will protect that soil.

In the north part of Weld County, in my district, you have thousands of acres that have been under this program.

And in spite of what Dr. Dixon expressed as a fear, what you have done is to cut down the number of cattle and keep the grass in shape so it does protect the topsoil.

Mr. PETERSON. We believe this program is compatible with the efforts that have been made out there so far.

You are all familiar with the fact that we have spent a number of millions of dollars in that area on emergency tillage payments during the past 2 or 3 years.

We believe that we can get more enduring benefits, more protection to the economy of the region and to the Nation through a program of this kind that we can by letting the land continue to suffer the damage of the drought and go in with emergency and temporary palliatives, so to speak.

Mr. KING. Will you yield to me for a question?

Mr. HILL. All right.

Mr. KING. In eastern Colorado, do you know of any grass or any other sort of vegetation which will hold the soil for the next generation any better than Russian thistles?

Mr. HILL. The fact of the matter is there is nothing worse than Buffalo grass and Russian thistles to destroy the whole affair. They are just like the hazel bush in the forest. They are there because the trees protect them.

This old sod that has grown there for years and years has been demonstrated time and time again that you can have new grasses superior to hold the soil and to produce feed.

Mr. KING. I was talking about Russian thistle.

Mr. HILL. It permits the ground to blow away.

Mr. HOPE. I will answer your question about Russian thistle. I do not think there is anything worse for the soil than to have it grow up in Russian thistles.

Mr. HILL. They do something else worse than that. They take every bit of the moisture out of the top of the soil. There isn't a chance in the world to get a blade of grass to grow.

Mr. KING. Nothing will grow out there in that dry weather.

The CHAIRMAN. We have three more witnesses. We have only about 25 minutes before adjournment.

Mr. Johnson wants to ask one question.

Mr. JOHNSON. Under the Soil Conservation Act that was just passed and under the ASC, haven't you got most of the power that you need to go ahead and do this now?

Mr. PETERSON. As I explained in response——

Mr. JOHNSON. I was away.

Mr. PETERSON. I am sorry that you were out, Mr. Johnson. I tried to answer that in response to a similar question from Mr. Cooley, earlier.

Under the Soil Bank Act the farmer determines for himself what he wants to put in, 10 acres or part of his farm——

Mr. JOHNSON. I am talking about the soil conservation.

Mr. PETERSON. Again, under soil conservation the farmer determines whether he wants to participate on 10 acres or one-fourth of his farm or any other. Under this program it is proposed that our technical people would sit down with the farmer and develop, on the basis of the land capabilities, how his farm should best be used, to accomplish the objective of stable production, protecting the land, and conserving the water.

Mr. JOHNSON. They tell him what he has to put in them, instead of his determining himself?

Mr. PETERSON. He determines whether he wants to adopt the program that is laid out and how he might adopt that program and still conduct his farming operations.

The CHAIRMAN. If I may interrupt, you have in mind, also, the entire area.

Mr. PETERSON. The entire farm; yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. The same principle is involved.

Mr. PETERSON. The same principles are involved.

The CHAIRMAN. We have present Mr. Williams and Mr. Ritchie. Do you desire to make any additional statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say in addition to what Mr. Peterson has said, however, that this problem area, Southern Great Plains, especially, has been under continuous study by farmers living within the area, by soil conservation district people, by the land grant colleges, the Great Plains Council, which consists of the representatives of the colleges out there, and representatives of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, and the recommendations contained in the President's program to the Great Plains of which this particular legislation is a part of that picture, have been arrived at after many, many years of study by all of those people.

And we think it is in the right direction. It does maintain the validity of a voluntary program, of the farmer deciding for himself what he wants to do after the information is available for him.

I think one of the things that the proposed legislation would do that is not now readily available is to make it possible over a period of years of the transition from the low producing croplands there now into grass cover as against the annual type of program that the agriculture conservation program cost-sharing now permits.

I think a period of 3 to 8 or 10 years may be necessary for much of those sandy lands to be converted from a cultivated state into a state of having good grass cover.

So I certainly want to emphasize the fact that the principles embodied in this proposal have had more serious consideration and we think they are in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ritchie, do you want to make a statement?

Mr. RITCHIE. No, sir; I have nothing to add.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your appearance here this morning.

Mr. JONES. You propose this program to be carried out under your already constituted ASC committee, is that right?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JONES. It would not require any further personnel to conduct the program?

Mr. PETERSON. We do not believe it would. There would be essentially three organizations within the department involved, the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, and undoubtedly, our State and county committee system.

Mr. JONES. But then the planning would be done by the local county ASC committee?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, the technical planning work would be done largely through Soil Conservation Service. After all, we are dealing with soils and principles of soil usage.

Our soil survey and the determination of land capability, of course, is the first step. That has been, as I pointed out, accelerated in the area now and is being constantly carried on.

Mr. JONES. It would be administrated through the ACS or the soil conservation districts?

Mr. PETERSON. That has not been determined fully, sir. My own view is that the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation Program Service would both heavily be involved.

As you are aware, the ACP program is now administered in the field through the State and county committees.

Certainly, there must be a maximum of local and individual farmer participation. After all, as I pointed out, it is a voluntary program to be accepted or rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield? I think he has asked a very pertinent question, because someone might very well propound that question to us if we take the bill to the floor of the House.

It occurred to me that with the Soil Conservation Service under Mr. Williams and ACS committeemen right at the grassroots, it would not be necessary for you to establish another agency within the Department.

Mr. PETERSON. No, sir; it would not be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like for the record to show that—Mr. Jones brought it up—the answer is, that you do not contemplate establishing or creating another agency within the Department.

Mr. PETERSON. We definitely do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You will work through existing facilities and personnel so far as that is possible.

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. From the testimony we have had here you will need more technicians than you now have.

Mr. PETERSON. We are gradually adding to our personnel, Mr. Johnson. How fast this particular program, if authorized, will move, we cannot now foresee. I think it will move in the beginning as most programs do, perhaps, slowly. It is a long-term program.

We would expect to propose to the Congress appropriations as determined to be necessary to provide the technical services to make it work at the rate that the farmers may desire.

Mr. WATTS. As I visualize the proposition you will enter into a contract with the farmer with respect to his entire farm?

Mr. PETERSON. Correct, sir.

Mr. WATTS. You probably will determine that certain portions of it should go into grass and there may be some portions that he can still cultivate.

Mr. PETERSON. We would anticipate in most instances there would be portions still suitable for cultivation.

Mr. WATTS. If you determine, we will say, that of 300 acres, 250 ought to be in grass, do you contemplate sharing with him the cost of getting that in grass?

Mr. PETERSON. Correct.

Mr. WATTS. Once it has gotten into grass, will the payments continue to be made on that portion of the farm?

Mr. PETERSON. No, sir.

Mr. WATTS. Then the plan once carried out and the objectives achieved of getting it out of cultivation into grass, and such other practices as your contract calls for, when the plan has been completed, there will be no more payments?

Mr. PETERSON. No land rental payments or anything of that kind. The only payments involved would be those of sharing the cost of making the necessary transition.

Mr. HAGEN. You provide, for example, that these wheat-acreage histories will be preserved. Is that correct?

Mr. PETERSON. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. Let us assume at the outset of the contract on a particular farm that wheat quotas were not in effect, but later on during the period of the contract they were, would you credit that man with the acreage he takes out initially or his history, or the allotment he would have received during that period?

Mr. PETERSON. I am not sure that I follow you.

Our thought is that whatever the present quota is for the farm that that wheat history would be preserved, so that if after the farmer had made these shifts and carried out the practices necessary to be carried out, in order to carry out his end of the contract, and he had then remaining land that was suitable for crop production, equivalent to his quota, he would be able to use that quota.

Mr. HAGEN. In other words, you would credit him with what his quota was at the outset of the contract even though it might have been normally smaller during some of the years following, that is, it might have gotten smaller.

Mr. PETERSON. We would preserve his history. In other words, we feel that the farmer who undertakes a program of better farm management should not be penalized by reason of loss of quota that he didn't use while making the transition.

Mr. HAGEN. I appear not to be making myself clear.

Mr. HOPE. Will you yield?

Mr. HAGEN. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. His base will be preserved, but not his quota or allotment.

Mr. PETERSON. His base would be preserved.

Mr. HAGEN. I was thinking of a situation at the tail end of the contract, that he might go back into wheat production. And actually if he was credited with what he might have had at the beginning of the contract, it might be a larger acreage than he might actually have received at the tail end of the contract.

Mr. HOPE. It only would be his base that would be preserved and he would take whatever cut or increase in allotments that anybody else took.

Mr. HAGEN. They would calculate what his wheat allotment would have been each year.

Mr. PETERSON. His history or base is preserved. And if the cut has taken place during a given year, why he would take the same cut as anyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. John Baker, we shall be glad to hear you now.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. BAKER, COORDINATOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I am John A. Baker, coordinator of legislative services, National Farmers Union, appearing here on behalf of Mr. James E. Patton, the national president.

I appear in support of H. R. 11831 and H. R. 11833, bills to provide for an additional supplemental farmland and water conservation program in the Great Plains area.

The special auxiliary farm soil and water conservation and development program that would be authorized by enactment of these bills is badly needed in the Great Plains area.

With proper and sympathetic administration, operation of the program would be a great boon not only to the area directly involved but to the Nation generally.

Rapid destruction of national natural resources and extreme human economic distress are unpredictably but constantly recurring in the Great Plains. Such conditions destroy natural wildlife cover. They contribute to flood damages in lower reaches of the streams, and endanger the Nation's future water supply, not alone for farming but for residential and industrial uses.

They contribute to a permanent destruction of soil resources. Farm families, caught in a web of adverse credit systems, high-cost production, and no Federal crop insurance, all beyond the power of the individual farmer to mend, find themselves in a greatly distressed condition when drought and high winds hit. In the absence of a universal crop insurance program this results in costly relief programs as well as a strain on national prosperity.

The situation has been getting increasingly severe in the southern Great Plains over the past 6 years. Reports of the past 2 weeks indicate similarly severe conditions may be developing now in parts of western South Dakota and surrounding areas.

Such conditions require not only immediate direct relief operations such as are established under other laws, fully as important, the Federal Government has a financial as well as conservational stake in aiding the farm families in the Great Plains in developing, insofar as scientific knowledge allows, a truly permanent farming pattern in the Great Plains.

H. R. 11831 and H. R. 11833, if enacted, would authorize establishment of one of the additional programs, but admittedly only a part, of the total required program.

It should be fully understood by everyone that these bills do not constitute a complete farm program for the Great Plains area. The proposed program is only one of several special programs needed to augment already existing nationwide farm programs, all of which were initiated or cultivated in your committee.

We would find it necessary to oppose passage of the bills now before you, if there should be indication on the part of Congress or the administration to consider the program covered under this bill as a substitute for already existing programs which, after enacted, could be used as an argument to eliminate the other programs such as farm income protection through price supports and crop insurance and other means, the agricultural conservation program, the conservation and acreage reserves and the other farm programs.

We know that such was not the intention of the authors of these bills. We hope you will make the record perfectly clear as you have very carefully done this morning, as the bills go through the legislative process, that this is an additional auxiliary program, not a substitute.

There has been some misunderstanding on this in various areas out in the Great Plains. That is why I mentioned it here as emphatically as I could.

At this point I want to commend the Department for the assurances given that the proposal is only a partial supplement, not a substitute for existing programs.

Another consideration of this kind is this. This proposed supplementary conservation program for the Great Plains is not and should not be considered as eliminating the need for an additional supplementary farm credit program for the Great Plains.

The improvements now adopted by the House, as recommended by your committee, in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Emergency Credit Act, are needed parts of the total special Great Plains program.

Moreover, in our opinion still further improvements in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, in the Emergency Credit Act, and in the Land and Water Conservation Loan Act, and the Emergency Credit Act of 1949 need to be made to round out the Great Plains program.

Even more complete provision than you have already made in the bill you recently approved needs to be made for loan funds to refinance existing indebtedness of farm families in the Great Plains area.

In the case of all these credit programs, provision still has not been made to allow the making of loans large enough in size either for initial loans or for total outstanding indebtedness to meet the needs of farmers who will want to qualify under the programs authorized under the bills now before you to make the needed large-scale shifts in type of farming and land use patterns.

For example, some of the small irrigation farmers in parts of this area, need a credit program that will enable them to purchase adequate grazing land—or land that can be put into grass—to enable them to round out an economic unit.

Similarly, farmers now located in nonirrigated areas when great shifts in land use should be made from annual crops to grass should have available adequate credit on appropriate terms and conditions to enable them to acquire, where feasible, enough irrigated land to enable them to insure an economic feed supply, regardless of rainfall conditions in specific years.

These are just examples of the flexibility required in the total program that is needed to enable the current farm residents of the Great Plains to make the shifts required to get on a permanent basis in the only manner consistent with the humanitarian and legal rights of American citizens under the Constitution.

The program that would be authorized by enactment of the bills now before you cannot stand alone. We would have preferred a "complete package Great Plains program" rather than the piecemeal approach that is apparently contemplated.

However, we do not oppose parts of the program even when presented in piecemeal fashion. But we do feel constrained to point out that a piecemeal approach out there in the area will not get the job done, either in terms of the national interest or in fairness to the people who live and try to earn a decent living on the farms of the Great Plains.

Specifically, we hope that inadequate credit facilities will not allow a condition to develop where any large number of farmers who contract with the Secretary under the Great Plains conservation program will in effect, be forced to breach the contracts they sign because of the lack of credit facilities to finance the unit organization and shifts in land use required by the contracts.

The bills leave to the Secretary the decision regarding the portion of the cost of conservation measures to be borne by payments. While

we do not recommend amendment of this language, we wish to invite your attention to the need for the Department of Agriculture to change its traditional view that such cost sharing should be on a 50-50 basis.

Farmers in the area with whom I have discussed these bills raised this question: "How can a broke farmer make much of a contributing share? Particularly, if he can't get credit anywhere?" I leave that question with the committee.

In our mature opinion, the share covered by the payment in drought-stricken areas of the Great Plains needs to be more than 50 percent. The payment part needs to be at least large enough to cover the cash costs of the installation or measure.

The payments involved must be large enough, in conjunction with the income earnable under existing farm income protection and price-support payments to sustain an American standard of life while making the proposed land-use shifts.

I was gratified to hear the Department witness say that they contemplate that the payments will be at least 80 percent of the total cost of the conservation measures under this program.

In conclusion, I want to put in a word for people as distinguished from scientific land-use planning. After it is all said and done, a very great many farm families and other people live in the Great Plains area of the United States. Many of them have lived there a long time, through thick and thin.

They know, most of them, from the flat shape of their billfolds, and from watching the dust laden winds blow by, as their crops wither and die, and the disastrous effects of somebody else's bad land-use blows over on them.

Yes, they know that some changes have to be made in land use and farming systems in the Great Plains. They want desperately to bring about such needed changes.

But they cannot be asked to do the impossible. Their existing property rights need to be honored and protected. Constitutional law as interpreted in thousands of city and rural zoning ordinance cases has always protected the rights, customs, and tenure of the so-called nonconforming user.

We need to be careful that this Great Plains program does not get so completely concentrated upon nonfarmers' ideas of what constitutes good land use, that we forget the rights and human feelings of the people who live on those farms.

As far as I know, no one seriously proposes that so-called proper land use and farming patterns in the Great Plains should be imposed by exercise of the police power. However, denial of Farmers Home Administration credit to a farmer unless he will conform with the "master plan" is fully as effective and probably is more quickly effective than exercise of police power under a zoning ordinance.

I am not suggesting that the bills under consideration move in this direction; my purpose here is to urge you to make the record clear that your purpose is to initiate and develop a completely voluntary program that conforms in spirit as well as letter to the constitutional protections that courts have traditionally provided to nonconforming users.

The Department's emphasis here this morning upon using land classification as a mandatory basis for eligibility for various programs.

is one of the items out in the Great Plains areas that has caused some considerable qualms and fears and apprehensions on the part of the farm folks out there with respect to this proposed Great Plains program.

Not these particular bills but the Great Plains program in total.

The various parts of the supplementary Great Plains program must be fitted together out there on the Plains so that farm by farm the various parts make sense and are humanly possible of attainment by the people who live there.

A point Mr. Hope made so much better earlier.

This means that the individual farm family must be enabled to acquire the credit, subsidy, and technical farm management assistance required to make the vast shifts in farming patterns that are required in the best interests of the Great Plains area and of the Nation generally.

We may enact these different parts of the program as separate public laws, but down at the Department of Agriculture, and particularly out there on the farms and ranches in the Great Plains, these must all be brought together in a cohesive and common-sense whole that will enable and encourage living farm families to participate happily and wholeheartedly in the program.

I was pleased to note that the Department witness, at least, partially recognized the significance of that point.

I believe the bills now under your consideration are a needed and desirable part of the approach to the Federal part of a program to aid Great Plains residents to develop a permanently sustainable and profitable agriculture in the area.

I, therefore, recommend that you approve it; and urge its enactment by this session of Congress.

I suggest that the Department should do a much better job than it has done to make known in the area this well-rounded approach as their witness expressed here verbally today. The people in the Great Plains have not gotten that picture as it was presented here.

And as I said earlier they have got some qualms and some apprehensions about these master plans and these other requirements that they cannot get credit, if they do not put a certain kind of grass on a certain acre of land, Mr. Cooley.

And they are raising questions and they are worried about this thing. And it would not be correct to say that at the moment they are wildly enthusiastic about this plan being superimposed on them.

They realize some change has to be made. And that they need some help to make it. But they have got qualms and apprehensions about all of this talk about the land going to be classified and every man has to put his cow where the Government tells him to.

I know that your committee agrees with me when I say that neither the program proposed by the bills before you nor any other farm program can succeed in the absence of a fully adequate farm income protection program and fully available yardstick family farm credit adapted to needs and requirements for shifting to a permanent agriculture in the Great Plains.

In this morning's mail I received a letter from a Kansas farmer, Mr. W. L. Gooding, whose post office address is Modoc, Kans., with an enclosed clipping from the Hutchinson, Kans., News-Herald.

Without endorsing everything in these two items, they do represent strong expressions of thinking people in a part of the Great Plains. Their expressions are pertinent to your consideration of the bills before you.

I request that they be made a part of the record following my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Without objection that will be done.

Mr. BAKER. That is with the exclusion, Mr. Chairman, of the picture of a banker in the clipping. There is no point in reproducing that picture.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. BAKER. Thank you.

(The letter and article are as follows:)

MODOC, KANS., June 23, 1956.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: Please find enclosed a clipping—showing a picture of the bank and banker of Leoti, Kans., with the paper's comment to the banker signed by "Hutch," plus a News article by the farm editor of the Hutchinson News Herald, Hutchinson, Kans., Bill Bork.

This picture and the article is nothing but an added insult to injuries already caused by the drought and the fallen prices of the farmers' commodities. The only way the politicians and the money grafters can get around this situation is by wisecracking, trying to mislead somebody.

The situation is really serious out here at this time. No rain since last October except 1¼ inches about 6 weeks ago. No one scarcely has cattle. Buffalo grass not more than an inch high and already turned brown. Pastures try to blow if any stock are running on it. Financial interests including the banks, have really been putting the pressure on causing many farmers to make public sales and to get out. One of the leading elevators told me that they hadn't even loaded out one boxcar of wheat since harvest started approximately a week ago. He said they have put some in the elevator. Farmers park their truck in the field and cut all day to get a load of wheat. Some have quit. This is dryland farming. Irrigated wheat, which is only a small amount, is making 35 to 40 bushels per acre.

You note Hollister, the banker, says he "will not leave till they load that last wagon." I think he stated that a little bit wrong. It should have read, he "wouldn't leave till he got the last dollar." And that wouldn't be out of line with the banking philosophy at all. In the first place, Bill Bork, the farm editor, never contacted the fellow who was being hurt. Only the politicians, the financial interests, who are making a desperate effort to cover up.

Yours truly,

W. L. GOODING.

P. S. I hope this article will be of some interest to you.

I am a subscriber of the Washington News Letter. I also subscribed for it to be sent to the chamber of commerce, Scott City, Kans., where the businessmen may become posted. They have to keep themselves in the background more or less because of their business, yet they are interested in the farmers' plight.

Now, I would suggest that the chamber of commerce at both Garden City and Tribune, Kans., be put on your mailing list. They surely need all this information before election. One leading businessman in Scott City told me he was getting fed up on politicians, and I have been told that by others, too.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald]

INTERCEPTED LETTER

ROSS HOLLISTER,
Banker, Leoti, Kans.

DEAR ROSS: Bet they never load that last wagon.

Yours,

HUTCH.

SOUTHWEST KANSAS IS LAND WITH A FUTURE

By Bill Bork and John McCormally

"You've got to be a special kind of guy to be a farmer out here—ornery as hell," says Scott county farmer, Lou Parkinson.

That comes as close as anything to summing up our 1,200-mile tour of 28 counties in the southwest one-fourth of Kansas.

It has been too long dry, too long since a bumper crop, not to be concerned about the economic condition of southwest Kansas. But it is one thing to be concerned, and quite another to be pessimistic. We came back not pessimistic, chiefly because we couldn't find many pessimistic people.

In a land like southwest Kansas there will always be failures and they will be personal, human tragedies. But the individual tragedies in 1956 come nowhere near adding up to an area tragedy.

There are too many people like Ethan Quackenbush, of Haskell County. He has 960 acres of dryland rented, raised a grand total of 760 bushes of wheat last year.

His wife is teaching school, to help make ends meet; the FHA loans are keeping him going, and his big hope as cutting started was to get enough wheat this year to pay some on the loans. A fonder, fainter hope is to get enough financing for an irrigation well. His situation does not look bright.

But while he sat in the City Cafe in Sublette at noon the other day, eating the luncheon special, we asked him: "Have you thought about quitting?"

"Quitting?" he sputtered, almost choking on a forkful of stewed hen and noodles. "Why would anyone think a thing like that?"

QUITTERS HAVE QUIT

Some observers say southwest Kansans are a lot worse off than they know and that more of them will quit when they realize it.

But Henry Parkinson doesn't agree. "They'll stay," he says. "Some of them will stay so long they can't leave. The quitters have already left."

Ward Stanley, Syracuse land company official, put it another, more pointed way.

When asked for information about those who had quit, Stanley turned to a long-legged dusty rancher who happened to be in the office.

"Don," he asked, "do you know of anyone of any consequence around here who's quit?"

"They've got faith, even if some of them haven't much else," says Oliver Brown, of Liberal. "And a lot of them figure they don't dare leave. If you ever get out, you can't get back in." Brown manages the huge Baughman layout, with 700 tenants. None of them has left for economic reasons, he says.

It is often pointed out how difficult—with \$100 land and expensive machinery—it is for a young man to start farming.

"But this," says Parkinson, "is the only country I know of where a man with little money still has a chance to get started farming." Parkinson doesn't say it is easy. But it is possible. "Try starting in Idaho where I came from," he says. "Irrigated land costs \$600 an acre and you have to wait in line for someone to die, to get a crack at it."

At Elkhart, Carl McClung reports from his land office that none of his tenants are leaving. Or if any do leave for reasons other than economic, there are always more to replace them. There are also far more buyers than sellers of land, McClung reports.

This project, which resulted in an 11-part News-Herald series, of which this is the last, began as an effort to find out if conditions in southwest Kansas were as bad as some reported them.

GREAT OIL FUTURE

It ends on a note of optimism. It has stressed mainly the agricultural economy of the area and has contrasted these times with the bad years of the 1930's.

One set of facts alone makes it impossible to compare the 1950's to the 1930's. Between 70 and 90 percent of all the land in this area is leased for oil or gas exploration, at \$1 a year per acre. Sizable bonuses are paid for lease renewals. And if a company can find an acre to lease in Morton County right now, the asking price is a \$100-an-acre bonus.

In the entire area, only two counties—Wichita and Greeley—do not have oil or gas production, or both. And the second wildcat is now being drilled in Greeley.

There was nothing to compare with this in the 1930's. What little land was leased brought only 50 cents an acre. Production was so negligible as to be mostly unnoticed.

Now, not only does the petroleum industry mean cash in the pockets of farmers and merchants; it also holds out a bright promise for the future of southwest Kansas.

But there are some hard, cold facts which city folks and politician should note.

It can get a lot worse. If it doesn't rain more in the next couple of years, to green up the grass and soak the soil, the situation can become desperate.

Credit, eventually, must be exhausted. Land prices will come down inevitably if there is a prolonged lack of income from the land. Local taxes will have to level off, which will mean an end to public improvements—school, hospital, and road-building which is providing seasonal work for farmers.

Even rain is no cure-all.

"If things get wet," points out Meade County Agent Gene Harris, "people will want to plant their land and the Government won't let them."

Farmers will be a longer time pulling out of this recession, many southwest Kansans argue. Acreage restrictions on wheat—in some counties only 50 acres to the quarter is permitted—prevent the farmer from planting a profitable amount of the one crop he can grow well.

PATTERN ON THE PLAINS

But the outlines of a fabulous future can be seen on the plains.

First thing to do, everyone agrees, is pray for rain.

Next, they say, is to work for legislation more favorable to the major crops of the area.

Then, there is a need to continue developing the farm production, other than wheat, such as sorghums, vegetables, sheep, poultry. This involves continued development of irrigation. It is looked on by many as insurance, not only against weather which ruins wheat, but also against further restrictions on wheat planting.

Another important need is for more small industry to absorb the people leaving the land as farms grow larger; and also to provide seasonal work for farmers who, in times of poor crops, need outside income to keep going.

These are the plans and the problems facing southwest Kansans. Having proved their ability to whip problems of drought and dust and going without money, they leave little doubt that they can best these other problems.

This hurried look at a big area makes no pretense of getting all the economic facts; but it aimed at getting the main ones. And it sought to capture the spirit of southwest Kansas, which has a way sometimes of making the facts meaningless.

It is the spirit expressed by Ross Hollister, the rough-hewn Leoti banker. We asked him casually when he planned to give up battling the uncertainties of southwest Kansas.

"I told the boys in the 1930's," he said, shaking a sturdy finger, "and I'm telling you now. When they load the last wagon and head it out of town, I'll crawl on the endgate."

Mr. HOPE. I have no question, but I would like to say that Mr. Baker, I think, has made a very fine statement. I am in hearty accord with it. I think he has made a fine contribution to a solution of the problem and has brought up some questions that we must take into consideration in dealing with this legislation.

I do not think, after hearing Mr. Peterson's statement, there are any great differences of viewpoint between Mr. Baker and those who are proposing this program. Of course, a great deal depends upon the way it is administered.

Mr. BAKER. Very much so.

Mr. HOPE. I think Mr. Baker has outlined some things that must be taken into consideration if its administration is to be a success.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Baker. We appreciate your being here.

At this time we will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:05 p. m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Friday, June 29, 1956.)

H. R. 11833

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 10, 1900

Read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

A BILL

To amend the Act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An Act to amend the several Acts relating to the Office of the United States Marshal, and to provide for the better management of the same," and for other purposes.

1. That the Office of the United States Marshal be and it is hereby established, and the same shall be organized and operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act.
2. That the Office of the United States Marshal be and it is hereby established, and the same shall be organized and operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act.
3. That the Office of the United States Marshal be and it is hereby established, and the same shall be organized and operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act.
4. That the Office of the United States Marshal be and it is hereby established, and the same shall be organized and operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11833

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 19, 1956

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-
4 ment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting “(a)”
5 after the period following “SEC. 16,” and (b) by adding the
6 following subsection:

7 “(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law:—

8 “(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the
9 amounts of such appropriations as may be provided
10 therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten

1 years with producers in the Great Plains area deter-
2 mined by him to have control for the contract period of
3 the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts
4 shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to
5 make, in orderly progression over a period of years,
6 changes in their cropping systems and land uses which
7 are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of
8 their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water
9 conservation measures needed under such changed sys-
10 tems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during
11 the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on
12 farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of
13 the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska,
14 New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota,
15 Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as
16 susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil
17 types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The pro-
18 ducer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming
19 operations which incorporates such soil and water con-
20 servation practices and principles as may be determined
21 by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of
22 climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located,
23 and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in
24 cropping systems and land use and of the conservation
25 measures which are to be carried out on the farm or

1 ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or
2 ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes.

3 Under the contract the producer shall agree—

4 “(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or
5 ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule
6 outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is
7 waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to
8 paragraph (3) of this subsection;

9 “(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments
10 or grants under the contract and refund to the
11 United States all payments or grants received there-
12 under upon his violation of the contract at any
13 stage during the time he has control of the farm
14 if the Secretary determines that such violation is
15 of such a nature as to warrant termination of the
16 contract, or to make refunds or accept such pay-
17 ment adjustments as the Secretary may deem ap-
18 propriate if he determines that the producer’s vio-
19 lation does not warrant termination of the contract;

20 “(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest
21 in the farm or ranch during the contract period to
22 forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under
23 the contract and refund to the United States all
24 payments or grants received thereunder unless the

1 transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the
2 Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

3 “ (iv) not to adopt any practice specified by
4 the Secretary in the contract as a practice which
5 would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

6 “ (v) to such additional provisions as the Secre-
7 tary determines are desirable and includes in the
8 contract to effectuate the purposes of the program
9 or to facilitate the practical administration of the
10 program.

11 In return for such agreement by the producer the Secre-
12 tary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those
13 conservation practices set forth in the contract for which
14 he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in
15 the public interest. The portion of such cost (including
16 labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary
17 determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the
18 physical installation of the conservation measures under
19 the contract;

20 “ (2) the Secretary may terminate any contract
21 with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer
22 if the Secretary determines that such termination would
23 be in the public interest, and may agree to such modifica-
24 tion of contracts previously entered into as he may deter-

mine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

“(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

“(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

“(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

1 “(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical serv-
2 ices of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in
3 determining the scope and provisions of any plan and
4 the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes
5 of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take
6 into consideration programs of State and local agencies,
7 including Soil Conservation Districts, having for their
8 purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water
9 conservation;

10 “(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
11 without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be neces-
12 sary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the
13 total cost of the program (excluding administrative
14 costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any
15 program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000.
16 The funds made available for the program under this
17 subsection may be expended without regard to the maxi-
18 mum payment limitation and small payment increases
19 required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be
20 distributed among States without regard to distribution
21 of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program
22 authorized under this subsection shall be in addition
23 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such
24 area authorized by this or any other Act.”

1 SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
2 of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with
3 the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as fol-
4 lows:

5 “(g) If the county committee determines that any pro-
6 ducer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain
7 in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather
8 conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county
9 committee not later than December 1 in any area where only
10 winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area
11 (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are
12 grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat al-
13 lotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather
14 conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year
15 shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of estab-
16 lishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments:
17 *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduc-
18 tion in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by
19 reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment
20 pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-
21 seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of
22 producing less than the normal production of the farm
23 wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this
24 Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm

A BILL

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 19, 1956

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

1 with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acre-
2 age allotment was established.”

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 9, 1956

For actions of July 6 and 7, 1956
84th-2nd, Nos. 113 and 114

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Accounting.....1,42	Fisheries.....27	Reclamation.....7,11,21
Adjournment.....9,13	Flood control.....29	Roads.....28
Appropriations.....1,4,9	Foreign aid	School construction.....26
Auditorium.....1	4,9,18,20,25,30,34	School milk.....35
Banking and currency....41	Forestry.....36	Security.....1,31
Budget Bureau.....1	Great Plains.....3,23	Soil bank.....38
Budgeting.....1,42	Legislative program.....9	States' rights.....12
CCC.....22	Livestock.....32	Sugar.....1
Claims.....1	Military construction.....24	Supply fund.....1
Conservation.....3,23	Nominations.....40	Surplus commodities.....
Crop insurance.....1	Ocean freight.....25	5,20,24,25
Development assistance..25	Packers and stockyards..14	Taxation.....10
Educational exchange....25	Personnel.....15,39	Technical assistance....25
Electrification....8,17,33	Postal rates.....2,37	Transportation.....16
Expenditures.....19	Public Law 480.....25	Virgin Islands.....1
Export control.....1	REA.....40	Watershed protection....29
FAO.....25	Real property.....10	Weather control.....1
FCA.....6,40		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported mutual security appropriation bill. House passed bill to increase postal rates. Senate committee reported bill for payment-in-lieu-of-taxes on Government property. Sen. Watkins introduced and discussed bill to transfer antitrust authority over packers from USDA to FTC. House committee reported supplemental appropriation bill. House passed bill to increase CCC borrowing power. House received conference reports on: Mutual security authorization bill. Military construction bill. House committee reported Great Plains bill. House passed fisheries bill. Senate committee ordered reported bill for study of foreign assistance program.

HOUSE - July 6

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, which includes the following items: Sugar Act program, CSS, \$189,000 increase (same as Budget estimate) in administrative-expense limitation (no additional appropriation required); Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, \$13,000,000 (same as Budget estimate) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Corporation in order to provide adequate working capital; export control, Commerce Department, \$3,000,000; Budget Bureau, \$375,000 (\$30,000 below the Budget estimate), to assist in effectuating Hoover Commission recommendations on budgeting, accounting, and management; Commission on Government Security, \$600,000; increase in capital of general supply fund, GSA, \$8,000,000; Virgin Islands Corporation, for loans, \$125,000; D.C. Auditorium Commission, \$150,000; and funds for payment of claims, audited claims, and judgments. (H. R. 12138, H. Rept. 2638, Congressional Record of July 7, p. 10862.)

July 6, 1956

Excerpts from committee report:

Sugar Act program. "Language was included in House Document No. 403 to increase by \$189,000 the limitation for administrative expenses for fiscal year 1957 to meet additional functions contained in revisions to the Sugar Act... To enable the Department to meet these new responsibilities, and to place compliance checking on a current basis as rapidly as possible, the Committee recommends the budget proposal."

Crop insurance. "The proposed language contained in the accompanying bill will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide an additional \$13,000,000 for capital stock of the corporation. Capital stock of \$100,000,000 is authorized of which \$27,000,000 has been subscribed to date."

"In view of heavy crop losses in certain disaster counties in recent years, the capital stock of the Corporation has been substantially reduced. It is estimated that the Corporation's net capital was about \$13.7 million as of June 30, 1956. Since a major portion of indemnities for the current year will be due in August and the bulk of premium collections are not available until several months later, early loss claims could exhaust the \$13.7 million before premium income is available."

"The Committee therefore recommends the proposed increase in the capital stock at this time to assure continued operation of this program, particularly in view of possible heavy losses in drought and disaster areas. It believes that assistance in disaster areas through this program is preferable to aid through disaster relief programs."

Advisory Committee on Weather Control. "The Committee has denied the estimate of \$350,000 for this activity, feeling that serious question exists as to whether or not its continuation is necessary. In addition, legislation authorizing extension of the Advisory Committee has not as yet been approved."

Budgeting; accounting. The committee report discusses in detail the Hoover Commission recommendations regarding cost-type budgets, annual accrued expenditure budgeting, etc.

The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "deferred action on a bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1957. Representative Patman requested rule waiving points of order, Representative Taber opposed granting of rule until authorizing legislation is enacted." p. D751

2. POSTAL RATES. Passed, 217 to 165, with amendments H. R. 11380, to increase certain postal rates (p. 10808). Rejected a Poage amendment to modify the increases in rates for publications devoted to agriculture (p. 10847).
3. CONSERVATION. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported H. R. 11833, to authorize a Great Plains conservation program. p. D750
4. FOREIGN AID. The "Daily Digest" states: "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 11356, mutual security program for fiscal year 1957. As agreed by the conferees, the bill would authorize a total of \$3.927 billion. The Senate- and House-passed totals were \$4.310 and \$3.567 billion, respectively." p. D751

The Appropriations Committee reported the mutual security appropriation bill for 1957 (H. R. 12130, H. Rept. 2636), and Rep. Taber waived points of order on the bill. p. 10854

The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of the mutual

security appropriation bill. p. 10859

5. MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 9893, which authorizes certain military public works and includes provision for financing some of these works from surplus agricultural commodities. p. D751
6. FCA AUDIT. Received from the Comptroller General the report on the audit of FCA for the fiscal year 1955 (H. Doc. 441); to Government Operations Committee. p. 10858
7. RECLAMATION. At the request of Rep. Forrester, S. 1622, to authorize the Interior Department to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, S. Dak., of the Missouri River Basin project, was recommitted to conference committee. p. 10856.
8. ELECTRIFICATION. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11477, to authorize construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes (H. Rept. 2635). p. 10859
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Majority Leader McCormack announced that D. C. bills will be considered Mon., to be followed by the mutual security appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill, respectively. He stated that a number of miscellaneous bills will then be taken up, including trip leasing, loans for central markets. Regarding adjournment prospects, he said: "I would say so far as the House is concerned, if we put in an hour or two extra at night, we ought to be able to get through with the necessary program in the House within the next 3 weeks." pp. 10851, 10852.

SENATE - July 6

10. TAXATION; REAL PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 4183, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property (S. Rept. 2424). p. 10787
11. RECLAMATION. Sen. Goldwater inserted a list of organizations which have been working against private development of Hells Canyon. p. 10790
12. STATES' RIGHTS. Sen. Stennis commended the Judiciary Committee for reporting S. 3143, to strengthen States' rights. p. 10792
13. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 9. p. 10804

BILLS INTRODUCED - July 6

14. PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS. S. 4177, by Sen. Watkins, to remove the special anti-trust jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture over packers, contained in the Packers and Stockyards Act, and to restore general jurisdiction over packers to the Federal Trade Commission; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author, p. 10788.
15. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12128, by Rep. Pelly, to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 10859
16. TRANSPORTATION. H. J. Res. 675, by Rep. Priest, designating the period Oct.

July 7, 1956

22 to 27, 1956, as National Transportation Week; to Judiciary Committee.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 6

17. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Reed, N. Y., inserted an editorial favoring private development of Niagara power. p. A5311
18. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Chipperfield favoring foreign aid. p. A5312
19. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Forand inserted a Knights of Columbus magazine article favoring economy in Government expenditures. p. A5342
Iowa,
20. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN AID. Rep. Martin/inserted an article by Alice Widener opposing S. Res. 85 and 86, providing for an international food bank. p. A5316
21. RECLAMATION. Rep. Green, Oreg., inserted a letter favoring the high Hells Canyon dam. p. A5345
She also inserted an AFL-CIO letter favoring the project. p. A5349

HOUSE - July 7

22. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Passed with amendment S. 3820, to increase the borrowing authority of CCC. The amendment to S. 3820 consisted of the insertion of the language of H. R. 11132, which had been passed as reported. H. R. 11132 was subsequently laid on the table. pp. 10864, 10895
23. GREAT PLAINS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11833, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program (H. Rept. 2640). p. 10926
24. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received the conference report on H. R. 9893, to authorize certain construction at military installations. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use for family housing construction in foreign countries, foreign currencies not to exceed \$250 million acquired through provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act or other commodity transactions of CCC (H. Rept. 2641). pp. 10886, 10926
25. FOREIGN AID. Received the conference report on H. R. 11356, the mutual security authorization bill (H. Rept. 2643). The conference report includes the following provisions: Authorizes appropriation of \$3,927,575,000 to carry forward the mutual security program, which is \$360,100,000 more than the original House bill. Authorizes \$293,000,000 for development assistance instead of \$243,000,000 as contained in the House bill; provides for a single economic development fund for all the countries of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa; provides that 80% of development assistance be on a loan basis, except to the extent that funds are used for financing sales of surplus agricultural commodities under sec. 402 or for regional projects. Increases the House authorization of \$1,400,000 for ocean freight charges on gift packages shipped by voluntary non-profit agencies to \$3,000,000, and eliminates the \$14,000,000 authorization for ocean freight charges on surplus agricultural commodities distributed by voluntary agencies "because provision has been made for paying such expenses out of Commodity Credit Corporation funds, under an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which was enacted after the mutual security bill passed the House"; increases the ceiling on U. S. annual contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

JULY 7, 1956.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 11833]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to implement the program for rehabilitation of the agriculture of the Great Plains by authorizing contracts of not to exceed 10 years between the Secretary of Agriculture and farmers and ranchers of the area under which the farming operations of the area will progressively be established on a soil- and water-conservation basis with substantial assistance from the Federal Government. The bill authorizes appropriations of not to exceed \$150 million for carrying out the program with the restriction that payments for any years shall not exceed \$25 million.

Enactment of the legislation was recommended by the Department of Agriculture in an executive communication dated May 24, 1956, copy of which appears below. Pursuant to the executive communication bills were introduced by Mr. Cooley, of North Carolina, the committee chairman (H. R. 11831), and by Mr. Hope, of Kansas (H. R. 11833). Hearings were held jointly on the two bills and witnesses from the Department of Agriculture and the major farm organizations appeared in support thereof. There were no witnesses opposed to the bill.

Following consideration of the bills in executive session, Mr. Cooley moved that the bill introduced by Mr. Hope (H. R. 11833) be reported.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The provisions of the bill will apply to farms and ranches in counties designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion in the following 10 States: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. Within the designated area the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to make contracts of not to exceed 10 years with agricultural producers for the gradual adoption in an orderly manner of changes in their cropping systems and land use which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and the area generally. The termination date of such contracts shall be not later than December 31, 1971.

Each contract will be based upon a plan of farming operations and a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use designed to bring into operation desirable conservation practices and adapt the farming operations to a system best designed to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. In the contract the producer will agree to carry out the program in accordance with the plan and schedule agreed upon, and not to adopt any practice specified as tending to defeat the purpose of the contract; and to forfeit all rights to further payments, and refund to the United States all payments or grants received under the contract, upon a substantial violation thereof or upon transfer of the producer's right and interest in the farm or ranch, unless the transferee agrees to assume the obligations of the contract.

In return for such agreement by the producer, the Secretary will agree to share the cost of carrying out the conservation practices set forth in the contract. Evidence presented to the committee was that the proposed Government share of the cost will average approximately 80 percent. The bill also provides, under circumstances detailed in the Department's letter, for preserving farm "history" of allotted crops during the transition period.

The bill authorizes to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation a maximum of \$150 million for the entire program, exclusive of administrative costs, but provides that not to exceed \$25 million of such funds may be expended on the program in any one year. The special program authorized in the bill is to be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in the area, such as the ACP program, the Soil Conservation Service program, or the Soil Bank.

VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

It is the specific understanding and intention of the committee in reporting favorably on this legislation that the program herein authorized is to be completely voluntary and that no pressure or coercion of any kind is to be exercised on farmers and ranchers in order to persuade them to enter into this program. Spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture assured the committee unequivocally that the program would be carried out on an entirely voluntary basis.

By a "voluntary basis" the committee means that the farmer or rancher shall not only be free to enter into or not to enter into the contracts authorized by this act but that no pressure shall be put on him, either directly or indirectly, by the Department of Agriculture in order to influence his decision. Participation in the program herein

authorized is not to be made a consideration in the granting of FHA loans or extending any other type of agricultural credit, in the making of acreage allotments, nor in the administration of any other program of the Department of Agriculture.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Following is the executive communication from the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this legislation and explaining the application of the proposed program.

MAY 24, 1956.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under date of January 11, 1956, the President submitted to you a program for the Great Plains. In conformity with this message we are transmitting proposed amendments to section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which are designed to assist in accomplishing the purpose indicated by President Eisenhower in his message. I recommend passage of these amendments.

The purpose of these amendments is to round out and make available a sounder and more workable approach to Federal cost sharing in meeting the conservation problems on individual farms and ranches of the Great Plains. They would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce a conservation program for that area and to enter into 10-year contracts with farm and ranch operators to terminate not later than December 31, 1971. Under these contracts producers would agree to a schedule of land-use adjustment and the necessary conservation measures which should be carried out in connection with such shift. The contract would provide for the carrying out in orderly progression over a period of years changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources on their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. The Secretary would agree to provide cost sharing for the carrying out of specified conservation measures which are a necessary part of the land-use adjustment.

The proposed program would differ from the regular ACP in that the contract would assure the necessary cost sharing assistance over a period of years long enough to complete the land-use adjustment. The contract would require the producer to render satisfactory performance in making the land-use adjustment and the application of the needed conservation measures.

The proposed program would differ from the soil-bank program in that it is aimed at obtaining a shift in land use rather than a reduction in production. It is designed to encourage a permanent shift in land use in the Great Plains taking into consideration the conditions which are peculiar to that area. The contract would give the producer assurance of the cost-sharing assistance needed to complete the conservation work in an orderly progression. No annual or rental-type payment is provided under this program but the producer would be permitted to utilize for grazing purposes the land established in vegetative cover under the contract, consistent with good range management. Cost-sharing assistance under this program would be

available for conservation measures on land being shifted and also on other land on the farm if the conservation measures are a necessary part of the land-use adjustment.

In the Great Plains area there are about 12½ million acres of cropland estimated to be unsuited for continuous crop production and which should be devoted to permanent vegetative cover. Of this amount we estimated that about 10 million acres would be on farms and ranches which are potential cooperators under this program which would require about \$112 million of cost-sharing assistance. (This is based on 80 percent of the estimated acreage cost of \$14 per acre.) In addition to seeding this area, certain range practices, such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed.

X In this area it is estimated that there are about 200 million acres of privately owned range and noncrop pastureland. Due to continued drought and concurrent damages from wind erosion, a relatively small acreage has become so badly depleted as to need range restoration measures. It is estimated that about 6 million acres of this land will need to be reseeded at a total cost of \$30 million (based on 80 percent of the estimated total cost of \$6.25 per acre), in order to bring it back to normal productive capacity. In addition to seeding this area certain range practices, such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed. It is estimated that the corollary measures to be installed on cropland and rangeland would involve the Federal expenditure of about \$8 million. Thus the total cost of the program proposed herein would be about \$150 million.

It is estimated that total payments for any one program year will not be in excess of \$25 million.

Since neither the Department nor the farm and ranch operators in the area have had any experience in this longtime "contract" approach, it is extremely difficult to make accurate estimates of the extent of participation or of the cost of administration. We have, therefore, attempted to keep our estimates on the conservative side. They may later need to be revised if experience dictates.

The authority requested in these amendments is predicated on a continuation of the ACP as presently authorized and the enactment of the soil-bank program as submitted. Otherwise this proposal would need to be revised in order to adequately meet the problems in the Great Plains area.

This proposal provides that in instances where any wheat producer is unable to seed his full wheat allotment due to unfavorable weather, he may, by notifying the county committee prior to December 1 where only winter wheat is produced or prior to June 1 in the spring wheat area, including those areas where both spring and winter wheat are grown, request that credit be given for seeding his full acreage allotment. If the county committee determines that the full allotment was not seeded because of the unfavorable weather, then the wheat allotment established for such farm will be considered as the planted acreage of wheat in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Regulations issued by the Secretary for each of the past several years provide for relief to farmers who are prevented from seeding because of unfavorable weather. This bill would provide legislative assurance to farmers of such adjustments instead of their having to rely on regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In addition, the bill would allow for the maintenance of wheat history on farms where no wheat is produced due to unfavorable weather, which would insure that any farm for which an allotment was established would retain its "old farm" status for any future wheat allotment program. Under existing law a farm on which no wheat is seeded during the preceding 3 years must be considered as a "new" wheat farm.

A producer could not claim the above privilege if he desired to obtain a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat through underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment or through producing less than the normal production of the farm acreage allotment.

Many producers maintain that present legislation encourages farmers to plant their full wheat acreage allotment each year in order to preserve their historical acreage. Under the proposed amendment farmers would in effect be excused from planting if unfavorable weather conditions prevailed at the time of their normal seeding season.

The proposed legislation has also been sent to the President of the Senate.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

SEC. 16. (a) The obligations incurred for the purpose of carrying out, for any calendar year, the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

(b) *Notwithstanding any other provision of law—*

(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and

Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland

acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including Soil Conservation Districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: Provided, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

SEC. 334. * * *

(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: Provided, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage

allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established.



Union Calendar No. 1064

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11833

[Report No. 2640]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 19, 1956

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 7, 1956

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-
4 ment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)"
5 after the period following "SEC. 16," and (b) by adding the
6 following subsection:

7 “(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

8 “(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the
9 amounts of such appropriations as may be provided
10 therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten

1 years with producers in the Great Plains area deter-
2 mined by him to have control for the contract period of
3 the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts
4 shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to
5 make, in orderly progression over a period of years,
6 changes in their cropping systems and land uses which
7 are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of
8 their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water
9 conservation measures needed under such changed sys-
10 tems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during
11 the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on
12 farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of
13 the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska,
14 New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota,
15 Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as
16 susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil
17 types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The pro-
18 ducer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming
19 operations which incorporates such soil and water con-
20 servation practices and principles as may be determined
21 by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of
22 climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located,
23 and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in
24 cropping systems and land use and of the conservation
25 measures which are to be carried out on the farm or

1 ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or
2 ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes.

3 Under the contract the producer shall agree—

4 “(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or
5 ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule
6 outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is
7 waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to
8 paragraph (3) of this subsection;

9 “(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments
10 or grants under the contract and refund to the
11 United States all payments or grants received there-
12 under upon his violation of the contract at any
13 stage during the time he has control of the farm
14 if the Secretary determines that such violation is
15 of such a nature as to warrant termination of the
16 contract, or to make refunds or accept such pay-
17 ment adjustments as the Secretary may deem ap-
18 propriate if he determines that the producer’s vio-
19 lation does not warrant termination of the contract;

20 “(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest
21 in the farm or ranch during the contract period to
22 forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under
23 the contract and refund to the United States all
24 payments or grants received thereunder unless the

1 transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the
2 Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

3 “(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by
4 the Secretary in the contract as a practice which
5 would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

6 “(v) to such additional provisions as the Secre-
7 tary determines are desirable and includes in the
8 contract to effectuate the purposes of the program
9 or to facilitate the practical administration of the
10 program.

11 In return for such agreement by the producer the Secre-
12 tary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those
13 conservation practices set forth in the contract for which
14 he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in
15 the public interest. The portion of such cost (including
16 labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary
17 determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the
18 physical installation of the conservation measures under
19 the contract;

20 “(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract
21 with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer
22 if the Secretary determines that such termination would
23 be in the public interest, and may agree to such modifica-
24 tion of contracts previously entered into as he may deter-

mine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

“(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

“(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

“(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of

1 wheat under the program carried out under this sub-
2 section shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

3 “(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical serv-
4 ices of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in
5 determining the scope and provisions of any plan and
6 the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes
7 of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take
8 into consideration programs of State and local agencies,
9 including soil conservation districts, having for their
10 purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water
11 conservation;

12 “(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be neces-
14 sary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the
15 total cost of the program (excluding administrative
16 costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any
17 program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000.
18 The funds made available for the program under this
19 subsection may be expended without regard to the maxi-
20 mum payment limitation and small payment increases
21 required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be
22 distributed among States without regard to distribution
23 of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program
24 authorized under this subsection shall be in addition

1 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such
2 area authorized by this or any other Act.”

3 SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
4 of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with
5 the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as fol-
6 lows:

7 “(g) If the county committee determines that any pro-
8 ducer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain
9 in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather
10 conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county
11 committee not later than December 1 in any area where only
12 winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area
13 (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are
14 grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat al-
15 lotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather
16 conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year
17 shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of estab-
18 lishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments:
19 *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduc-
20 tion in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by
21 reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment
22 pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-
23 seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of
24 producing less than the normal production of the farm

1 wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this
 2 Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm
 3 with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acre-
 4 age allotment was established.”

Union Calendar No. 1064

84TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 11833

[Report No. 2640]

A BILL

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic
 Allotment Act and the Agricultural Ad-
 justment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great
 Plains conservation program.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 19, 1956

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 7, 1956

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
 the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

July 23, 1956

licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws. p. 12783

Passed without amendment S. 3458, to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries. This bill is now ready for the President. p. 12784

32. WATER SUPPLY. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over S. 2374, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies from flood control and river and harbor projects. p. 12774
33. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed, under suspension of the rules, H. R. 12080, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, and Army flood control projects. p. 12812
34. WATERSHEDS. The conferees agreed to file a report (but did not actually file a report) on H. R. 8750, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. p. 12869
35. MINING. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 3941, relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the Act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period. p. 12868
36. GRAIN STANDARDS. Passed without amendment S. 1400, to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the U. S. Grain Standards Act by providing penalties for persons who knowingly sample grain improperly and for persons who knowingly load or otherwise handle grain deceptively for inspection under the Act. This bill is now ready for the President. p. 12785
37. CROP INSURANCE. At the request of Rep. Byrnes, passed over H. R. 5275, to authorize FCIC to provide reinsurance on any crop or plantation insurance provided in Puerto Rico by a duly-authorized agency of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. p. 12794
38. SOIL BANK. Reps. Mason and Anderson objected to the consideration of H. R. 11958, to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of certain drought damaged acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest. p. 12794
39. GREAT PLAINS. Passed without amendment H. R. 11833, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program. Prior to this action, at the request of Rep. Aspinall, the House had passed over the bill during the call of the Consent Calendar. pp. 12805, 12872
40. CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS. Rejected S. 1644, to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. Although 245 voted in favor of the bill and 145 against, a two-thirds majority was required since the bill was considered on a motion to suspend the rules. p. 12839
41. FARM LABOR. Passed as reported S. 3391, to provide reasonable requirements regarding comfort, safety, etc., of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers. p. 12853
42. TRADE FAIRS. Passed as reported S. 3116, to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges

and participation in international fairs and festivals. p. 12861

43. WOOL IMPORTS. Rejected H. R. 12227, to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on wool. Although 216 voted for the bill and 123 against, a two-thirds majority was required since the bill was considered under suspension of the rules. p. 12874
44. TOBACCO. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 12114, to provide for the refund or credit of internal revenue taxes paid or payable with respect to alcohol and tobacco products destroyed or rendered unmarketable as a consequence of a major disaster. p. 12869
45. ATOMIC ENERGY. At the request of Rep. Cunningham, passed over H. R. 9743, to encourage maximum development of atomic energy reactors for the generation of low cost electric power and the production, utilization, and treatment of special nuclear and other materials. p. 12775
46. RECORDS. At the request of Rep. Cunningham, passed over S. 2364, to further clarify GSA's jurisdiction over records' disposition. p. 12773
47. VETERANS' BENEFITS; FARM LOANS. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 9260, to extend the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 for 1 year until July 25, 1958. This bill is now ready for the President. p. 12880
48. SOCIAL SECURITY. Rep. Philbin supported the proposed changes to the Social Security Act providing clarifications and extensions of benefits under the Act. p. 12885
49. PERSONNEL. At the request of Rep. Cunningham, passed over H. R. 11515, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the U. S. and Alaska. p. 12785
Passed as reported S. 3481, to increase the salaries and provide other benefits for employees in the Foreign Service. p. 12854
50. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the Consent Calendar would be called on Thurs. and that the cranberries marketing bill would be considered later in the week. pp. 12807, 12880
51. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957. As reported (see Digest 124), this bill, H. R. 12350, includes the following items: Atomic Energy Commission, various amounts, including funds for the power reactor development program; South-eastern Power Administration, \$500,000; and Bureau of Reclamation, \$2,500,000.
Electrification. The committee report includes the following discussion under the atomic energy items:
"Funds for the reactor program have been increased by \$40,000,000. This \$40,000,000 and the \$10,000,000 in the budget estimate... together with the \$15,000,000 in the budget estimate... will make a total of \$65,000,000 available for acceleration of the power reactor program."
"The Committee has been deeply disturbed for a considerable period of time over the lack of progress in developing atomic electric power...
"Much has been said and written on the subject of the plentiful resources of the United States. However, there has not been adequate recognition given to the conclusive fact that these resources are not inexhaustible and that they must be conserved. The need for conservation of these natural resources is the

International Association of Accident and Health Underwriters.

Multiple Sclerosis Foundation of America.

Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America, Inc.

National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

National Association of Retail Drug-gists, and many others.

In the city of Chicago there are accredited medical schools of high quality, such as the University of Chicago School of Medicine, Northwestern University Medical School, Chicago Medical College, University of Illinois School of Medicine, and Loyola University School of Medicine.

There are research institutes such as the Hektoen Institute of the Cook County Hospital, the Nelson Morris Institute of Michael Reese Hospital and its Psychosomatic Institute, the Otho A. Sprague Memorial Institute.

Approximately 100 hospitals are located in Chicago. These include the Cook County Hospital, the Billings Memorial Hospital, the group associated with Northwestern University which includes Passavant, Wesley, and the veterans' hospital.

The city of Chicago has a municipal tuberculosis sanitarium which is one of the largest and best recognized in the world and associated with it other institutions such as dispensaries and sanitariums.

In all of these institutions medical research is carried on of a high order and on a considerable scale.

Because of its central location the city of Chicago more often than any other city in the country welcomes conventions and assemblies of doctors, including regularly the annual meeting of the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology, the American Academy of Dermatology, the American Academy of Gynecology and Obstetrics, and the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgery. To these conventions come many thousands of physicians who are interested in the advancement of medical science.

So much interest has been displayed in the possible location of the National Library of Medicine where it would serve a far wider range of persons and institutions in the field of medicine than if it were located in any other city that the Medical Center has offered as a gift nine acres of ground, and similarly the University of Chicago and Northwestern University have offered to make land available in the medical centers under their jurisdiction for the building of this library.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill. (Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I favor passage of the bill to create the National Library of Medicine.

This bill is concerned with the greatest medical library in the world, which is now known as the Armed Forces Medical Library. It contains almost a million books and pamphlets. It also houses portraits and photographs of outstanding medical men, and the completeness of

its periodicals makes it preeminent in the field of scientific research libraries. The need for the bill at this time is because these precious scientific books and publications are housed in extremely poor facilities in buildings which make the library susceptible to destruction by fire or storm. This bill proposes to build facilities which would provide adequate housing for the library.

No one disputes the fact that a good library building should be constructed. Such a building is imperative. The dispute arises as to where the building should be located, whether in the District of Columbia or in the city of Chicago. We think it should be located in the city of Chicago. We hope the Board of Regents will see fit to select Chicago as the new site for the library.

Chicago is the logical place to establish the National Library of Medicine for the following reasons:

First, Chicago is ideally situated geographically. It is close to the center of the country and to the center of population. It is easily accessible by railroad and its airports have the greatest traffic of any city in the country. In a few years it is anticipated that the St. Lawrence seaway will make the city of Chicago a world port bringing visitors from all over the globe.

Second, Chicago is a center of medical education. It has five major accredited medical schools and almost 100 hospitals. The Medical Center which is well on its way to completion on the southwest side of the city, will place Chicago in the forefront of medical progress among the great cities of the world.

Third, All major medical societies are located in the city of Chicago. We now have the national offices of the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American College of Surgeons, the American Hospital Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and many others. As of 1940, 24 national medical journals were published in Chicago, including the official journals of the American Medical Association, and other such groups. The Chicago area has more persons employed in medical and health activities than any other major metropolitan area except New York City. This is true as well, for persons employed in manufacturing drugs and medicines. The Chicago area, too, has more physicians, surgeons, and dentists in active practice than any other city except New York.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue indefinitely to list the many attainments which have given Chicago such an outstanding place in the medical world. I feel certain that when the Board of Regents makes its investigation and its determination of the place where the library should be located, it will select Chicago.

(Mr. BOWLER (at the request of Mr. YATES) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It is a good bill. It has been evident for a long time that the very valuable books and documents of the Armed Forces Medical Library should be placed in adequate housing.

For some weeks a dispute has existed as to whether the new library should be

located in the District of Columbia or in the city of Chicago. I, of course, am firmly of the opinion that the library should be located in Chicago because of the many advantages Chicago offers to the medical profession, to the Armed Forces, and to the people of our Nation.

I am particularly interested that it should be in Chicago because of the location in my district of the greatest medical center in our country, if not in the world. Located on the near west side of Chicago, the medical center district is an area of 305 acres, set apart by the State legislature for the expansion and development of medical institutions. It is within a few minutes' ride of the downtown loop business district, along the new Congress Expressway.

The district contains three hospitals, with 5,600 beds, including Cook County Hospital, which is the largest general hospital in the world. Within it are located 3 medical colleges, a postgraduate school of medicine, 2 dental colleges, 3 schools of nursing, a college of pharmacy, and a dozen other related institutions. More than 3,000 students are enrolled in its professional schools. Approximately 2,500 physicians come to the medical center each year for postgraduate studies. Since 1951, 15 new medical institutions have been completed within the district. Another unit is under construction at the present time, and plans have been made for additional medical facilities in the near future. This unique concentration of medical service, research, and education makes this area the foremost of all medical centers. It is the natural location for the new National Library of Medicine.

The Chicago Medical Center is under the supervision of the medical center commission. Drs. Walter H. Theobald and Karl A. Meyer are among the most distinguished men of medicine in the Nation. They are the guiding lights and dynamic force building this great center dedicated to the welfare of men, women, and children everywhere. They have foreseen the need for this library as an adjunct to the work of their dynamic medical community. They have offered to donate a valuable tract of land in the heart of the medical center, containing approximately 8½ acres, as a base for the library building. Their generosity should be noted by the board of regents.

Chicago is the natural location for the new National Library of Medicine. I feel certain that the board of regents, when appointed, will agree with this conclusion.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, because of the appropriation authorized by this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11682) to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a rather lengthy bill and covers a number of subjects. There is, however, no departmental report included, as a part of the committee report so we, on the "committee of objectors," are unable to determine whether this bill is in accordance with the Department's recommendation.

Mr. COOLEY. This bill has been prepared actually by the Department of Agriculture. It was submitted to us in a communication and came to the committee in the form in which it is now presented. It has the support of the Department of Agriculture. I might say that we refer to this as the housekeeping bill because through the years the Committee on Appropriations has provided appropriations for the Department of Agriculture to carry on certain activities for which authorizing legislation had been based on the organic act.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understand this is very similar as far as its objectives are concerned to the bill that we received last week from the Committee on Armed Services, namely, to put into the basic law some of the legislative provisions which have been incorporated in appropriations acts; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In that bill we ran into several items that were controversial. Can the gentleman advise us whether there are any provisions in this bill that are controversial?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think there is any controversy about it. It was unanimously reported by our committee. I have a letter of May 25, 1956, addressed to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I must assume there is no objection, if it was unanimously reported.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether this legislation has been checked by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture for Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. COOLEY. The action of that committee precipitated the necessity for this bill. They have been granting legislative authority on appropriation bills. Certainly it seems entirely proper for the legislative committee to take action pending obtaining permission of the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. The gentleman from Kansas is here, and he can speak for himself.

Mr. HOPE. I do not understand why the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations should object to this bill, because they have been doing these things that we are trying to correct because they felt it was the proper thing to do, from an appropriation standpoint. But the authority does not exist for the provisions they have put into the appropriation bill. What we are trying to do is assist them by granting authority in legislation to continue what they have been doing. There is not an item in this bill that was not here except that it has been carried in an appropriation bill in recent years.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that there are at least perhaps three items which were not in the fiscal 1957 appropriation.

Mr. COOLEY. There are three items that are not legislation. That is section 8, section 12, and section 13, but all of those 3 sections are supported by the Department of Agriculture, after full and complete hearings, and approved by the membership of our committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. Section 11 of the act of May 29, 1884, as added by the act of September 21, 1944 (21 U. S. C. 114a), and as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. The Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States or political subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations and similar organizations, and individuals, is authorized to control and eradicate tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, brucellosis of domestic animals, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, scabies in sheep and cattle, dourine in horses, scrapie and blue tongue in sheep, incipient or potentially serious minor outbreaks of diseases of animals, and contagious or infectious diseases of animals (such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, and contagious pleuropneumonia) which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute an emergency and threaten the livestock industry of the country, including the payment of claims growing out of destruction of animals (including poultry), and of materials, affected by or exposed to any such disease, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. As used in this section, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the act of February 28, 1947 (21 U. S. C. 114c) is hereby amended by inserting, immediately following the word "act" where it first appears therein the following: "and section 11 of the act of May 29, 1884, as added by the act of September 21, 1944, insofar as said act relates to diseases which in the opinion of the Secretary constitute an emergency and threaten the livestock industry of the country."

SEC. 4. Funds available for carrying out the activities of the Department of Agriculture shall be available for expenses of advisory committees, including travel expenses in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 5. The Department of Agriculture is authorized to furnish subsistence to employees without consideration as, or deduction from, the compensation of such employees where warranted by emergency condition connected with the work under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (as added by the act of February 29, 1936 (16 U. S. C. 590n), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Payments to claimants under sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of this act may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, which certificate shall be in such form as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, that he has carried out the conservation practice or practices and has complied with all other requirements as conditions for such payments and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief, under the penalties of title 18, United States Code."

(b) Payments of grants under sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, may be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committees appointed pursuant to section 8 (b) of such act, for the respective States.

(c) Section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590k), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. All funds available for carrying out this act shall be available for allotment to the bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal or State Governments, or to local public agencies, as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this act, and for payments to committees or associations of producers in any region or regions to cover the estimated administrative expenses to be incurred by any such committee or association in cooperating in carrying out this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary may prescribe that all or part of such estimated expenses of any such committee or association may be deducted pro rata from the payments or grants made to the members thereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance: *Provided further*, That the transfer of funds for services of technicians in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation programs, from allotments for agricultural conservation payments within a State, shall be subject to such limitations and conditions as may be provided in appropriation or other law. Funds so transferred may be placed in a single account for each State."

SEC. 7. Section 392 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 139 (b)), is amended changing the period at the end of the first sentence to a comma and adding the words "unless otherwise provided by appropriation or other law," and by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a comma and adding the words "unless otherwise provided by appropriation or other law."

SEC. 8. Section 606 of title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1766) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Funds available for the purposes of this act may be used for extending courtesies to representatives of foreign countries,

merit, that when under our so-called foreign-aid program, we build facilities for our own armed services or other operations overseas, we are building facilities which will, of course, be left there and greatly benefit those countries.

Now, here is a case where we will be doing something for the best interests of the Western Hemisphere and of the United States, from which the city of Cleveland will be benefited through certain facilities left there.

Surely we should not refuse to do what is good for our country and the hemisphere just because it would also help the city of Cleveland.

But, is it not also true that the city of Cleveland is putting in more of its money to help our foreign policy than we are putting in of Federal money to help Cleveland?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. JUDD. This bill is for the best interests of the whole country and the continent. It is not possible to hold these Pan American games without some benefit, as well as some cost, to the city where the games are held. Buenos Aires held them 4 or 5 years ago; Mexico City held them about 2 years ago and did a wonderful job. We certainly must do no less.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. It would be a sad moment indeed if these games were allowed to go back to South America and they will feel we are unfriendly and we probably will not have an opportunity to have them again. It is a moment when we can really prove our friendship.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I think we should remember, as is pointed out in the letter from the Secretary of State, that the national governments of both Argentina and Mexico provided substantial financial support in the organization of the games in their capitals. Now, when this comes to the United States the Government of the United States should do its part. The committee feels that this is a fair share for our Government to contribute to the foreign policy part of this good-will gesture to carry out the spirit of the Declaration of Panama in which the heads of these Republics joined within the past few days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the pan-American games must be regarded as much more than a series of athletic contests among 29 friendly nations. They are much more than that, for the bringing of these games to this country will give the American people an outstanding opportunity where they are host to these other nations to sell their American way of life and their culture and the many other fine attributes this country has.

I might also say that the permanent benefits that will result from these games, which will accrue to this country are far beyond a mere dollar-and-

cents value. I certainly hope the House will go along with the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill would establish a dangerous precedent. If this bill were to pass it would seem that all you have to do is invite some athletic team from some other country and then you could go to Uncle Sam and use that as a basis upon which to ask for a handout. Let me give you an illustration. We in Wisconsin, in the city of Milwaukee 2 years ago played host to the Little World Series, where there were participating baseball teams from all over the world, not merely from the Western Hemisphere. I understand some 30 nations were represented. We did not come to Uncle Sam and ask for a handout. We financed it through voluntary contributions because we believe in good will. It came from our hearts. We wanted the Little World Series there. We asked for it. We invited them to come. But we did not go to Uncle Sam and ask him to foot the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think if we pass this bill we are setting a precedent so that whenever you invite some hockey team from Timbuktu to come over here, you could then go to Uncle Sam and ask for a handout. In my judgment it sets a dangerous precedent. I would much rather that these contributions come from the hearts of the people of America and not from the taxpayers of the United States of America. Then you will create good will.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the lady.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman that this is not an ordinary thing. It is on a par with the Olympic games. It is the only thing that could possibly compare with it. It cannot be compared with some little baseball games.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would much rather see a baseball game than the Olympic games, any time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I take this time, since I am sure the committee went into the question, to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] how much money we are contributing toward defraying the expenses of the Olympic games in Australia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We are not contributing any amount. As the gentleman knows, every time a ticket is sold to a sports event in this country, a certain part of the price of the ticket, 25 cents or 50 cents, or whatever it is, goes into a pool to promote the Olympic games in Australia. There is not any Federal money spent for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. And public donations, public contributions are also being sought is that not true?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. To defray the expenses of American athletes to the Olympic games.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might also say, to complete the gentleman's answer that last year the House passed a bill which I introduced exempting from the admissions tax the tickets to any activity undertaken in connection with raising funds for the Olympic games. I add that merely to amplify what the gentleman has already said.

Mr. GROSS. That is all very fine, but it does not take care of this business of appropriating \$5 million of the taxpayers' money to the city of Cleveland to defray a part of the expense of holding the pan-American games.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Where are the Olympic games to be held?

Mr. GROSS. I said the pan-American games.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But the Olympic games are not held here.

Mr. GROSS. They are held in Australia.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. So you do not need the facilities in this country in order to hold the games?

Mr. GROSS. Of course not, but after all, if we are making contributions to foreigners, and that is what we are doing here, this is a foreign aid handout in reverse. That is just what the gentleman from Minnesota just got through saying, or he implied that.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman is exceedingly good in the use of words. But the actual fact is that these games will be a contribution to understanding and goodwill between the countries involved; yes. And America will benefit greatly in the eyes of the countries that participate by having these visitors come here and enjoy our hospitality; yes. But otherwise it is not a contribution to foreigners.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised someone has not contended that this \$5 million handout is necessary to our national security. I am surprised somebody has not injected that into the argument up to this point.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Is it not pathetic that our Olympic athletes have to be subjected to all the fund-raising activities they have to go through? Is it fair for them to have to undergo that and then meet in competition athletes who are subsidized?

Mr. GROSS. I do not think they feel they are being treated unfairly. If the Federal Government is going to appropriate tax money for this purpose, then we will have the same situation as in Russia, whose athletes who are professionals. I doubt that you want that. I am opposed to taking \$5 million of the taxpayers' money to underwrite the pan-American games at Cleveland, period.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 18?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "Sec. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed 10 years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary

may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

"(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future, State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150 million, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25 million. The funds made avail-

able for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other act."

Sec. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, 77th Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOPE. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the very distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is the author of this measure which I am now calling up for consideration.

May I observe that the gentleman from Kansas has served with great ability, competency, and distinction in this House for many, many years. A number of bills have passed bearing his name. This is probably the last Hope bill that will be presented to the Congress of the United States because when this session ends, we will lose the valuable services of this great statesman. I know he is loved by all of us and held in high esteem by every Member of both Houses of Congress. I do not know of anyone who has devoted himself more untiringly to the public service, nor do I know of anyone who is more worthy to retire. It is our pleasure to bring this bill to the floor of the House, and it is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to present the bill and I do so with great respect.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Now that the House has expressed such great confidence in my colleague, I am quite certain that

the Members will accept his views concerning this measure.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, greatly moved by the kind remarks of my distinguished colleague from North Carolina and for your most generous response to what he said. The fact is I am somewhat overwhelmed, and I cannot at this moment find words to express my thanks to him and to you. I do want you to know that this will always remain one of the high spots in my life and I shall never forget this demonstration of your friendship and kindness.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, I do not want to take the time of the House to discuss this measure at any length, but I think I should explain it briefly before asking you to vote for it.

On January 11, last, the President sent to the Congress a message entitled "Program for the Great Plains." The area covered by that message comprises parts of 10 States with a population of 17 million people. It consists of some of the richest and most productive soil in this country. It is a great agricultural empire. But, to a greater extent than most areas it is subject to the vagaries of the weather and to recurring periods of drought. For that reason agriculture there must be carried on somewhat differently than it is in those parts of the country where the weather is consistently more humid.

The program which was submitted by the President is designed primarily to stabilize the agriculture of the area. Most of it can be carried out under existing legislation. However, it is necessary to enact the particular measure which is now before us in order to round it out.

This measure does two things. One, is to provide an amendment to the soil conservation and domestic allotment act whereby soil conservation programs can be carried out through the medium of contracts with farmers for as long as 10 years.

It differs also from the soil conservation and domestic allotment act proper in that it provides for placing entire farms in the program instead of just such part of the farm as a farmer may want to bring under it. It has some features of the soil bank program but differs from it in that its principal purpose is a change in land use rather than a reduction in agricultural production.

It is a voluntary program in every respect. It has been worked out through conferences with farmers and businessmen in the area, and by utilizing the accumulated experience of farmers, the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Conservation program, the Farmers Home Administration, the land grant colleges and the other Federal and State agencies including the Great Plains Council. I think it is sound and given time will be a success in every way.

The second thing this bill does is to provide that farmers who produce wheat, which is the basic crop of that area, will not be required in years of unfavorable weather to plant their acreage in order to hold their allotments. This is a sound proposal, because without legislation of this kind farmers feel they must plant their land in order to

hold on to their allotments. In addition the bill will permit the maintenance of wheat history on farms where no wheat is produced because of unfavorable weather conditions.

That sums up in brief the purpose of this legislation. The people of 10 States are interested in it. It is a part of the President's program and that of the Department of Agriculture. It will bring about the best possible use of the great agricultural resources of the area.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House will pass this legislation by the large majority which I believe it deserves on its merits.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in support of the bill that is before us. This proposed amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act will provide a tool essential to implementing a long-range program of land use adjustments and soil conservation in the Great Plains area.

The Department of Agriculture has developed an effective long-range program for the Great Plains. Its objective is to assist farmers and ranchers to develop for themselves a land-use program which will help them avert many of the hazards that come with the recurring droughts common to the region.

This program looks forward to preserving and enhancing the great productive capacity of the Great Plains. It rests on the foundation blocks of further conservation, wise use and management of the area's soil and water resources. It recognizes the fact that if the agriculture of the Great Plains is to be stable certain portions should be permanently in grasses.

The program encompasses a wide variety of assistance to farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains. It is a many-pronged approach through which the total facilities of the Department of Agriculture can be brought to bear simultaneously on the difficult problem in a coordinated manner. The heart of the program is a long-time conservation plan for individual farms and ranches through which conservation and land-use adjustments can be worked out with producers in accordance with the capabilities of their land.

The authority is already available for carrying out most of the phases of the total effort, and work is under way. The land classification work of the Soil Conservation Service has been intensified. The program of on-the-farm technical assistance in soil and water conservation through soil-conservation districts is being accelerated by the Soil Conservation Service.

The ACP cost-sharing program on those practices that are intended to bring about those land-use adjustments required for a long-range program are being accelerated and rates of payment have been made more flexible. Farm credit programs are being geared to meet the need for intermediate- and long-term credit to permit the enlargement and adaptation of farm units that are now too small or improperly organized to make the best use of resources.

Federal crop insurance is being further developed and strengthened to eventually serve as a major protective measure against crop losses in all areas suitable for arable farming. An expanded, sustained, cooperative, coordinated program of research is being developed. Educational efforts of the State extension services are being stepped up.

All of these efforts are important and helpful, but to be fully effective there is need for assuring producers of continuing cost-sharing assistance for applying soil and water conservation measures over a period of years.

Take, for example, the problem of a young farmer who is confronted with the problem of converting from straight wheat farming to a combination of wheat and grass farming. He cannot make a shift in a 1-year period. It takes a period of several years for the conversion, and he has to be able to make a living while the conversion is being made. He needs continuing assistance throughout the period of conversion.

The Department of Agriculture does not now have the authority to guarantee producers this continuing assistance. The bill we are considering would give the Department the authority to make long-term contracts with producers assuring continuing cost-sharing assistance as they move forward in the installation of and inauguration of the various segments of the conservation plan developed for their operating unit.

This is what this young farmer needs to make the conversion because of the high cost of converting and the long period of time that is involved.

The situation might be described this way. It is like trying to drive a car down the road with the brake dragging on one wheel holding back the whole car. The logical thing to do is to get the brake released on that one wheel. The bill we are considering will release the brake on the one wheel of the Great Plains program that is slowing up progress.

There are several features of this bill that I believe will be especially important to the farmers and ranchers of my State, Colorado. For one thing, it makes possible a continuation of the contract for applying the conservation plan to the land if there should be a change in ownership. If a man wants to sell his land, he can go ahead and sell it and the new buyer will continue with the conservation effort where the last owner left off.

It will give farmers a new opportunity to plant some trees around their farmsteads for shelter from the cold winds in the winter and for shade in the hot summer weather. It will give new opportunities for planting more of the new grasses that have been developed and are being developed for our area of the country.

This bill has many advantages for helping to protect and improve the soil resources of the Great Plains so that we can continue to supply our share of the food and fiber needs of the entire Nation. I urge that the House support this worthwhile and necessary legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 11832?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CERTAIN WOOL IMPORT DUTIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12227) to amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to import duties on wool.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of paragraph 1101 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 1101 (b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the word "foregoing" the following: "and all other wools of whatever blood or origin not finer than 46s, and hair provided for in paragraph 1102 (b)"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That a tolerance of not more than 10 percent of wools not finer than 48s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 46".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be effective only with respect to wool and hair entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the 3-year period beginning on the 60th day after the date of the enactment of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wool and hair."

Mr. REED of New York rose.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. The committee report says the bill came from the committee by unanimous action. I am opposed to the bill and demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York does not qualify. The gentleman from Idaho qualifies.

Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 12227, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to suspend for a period of 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wool and hair imported under both for use in the manufacture of certain cloth articles such as carpets and other floor coverings.

Paragraph 1101 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, provides for free entry under bond of imports of certain wools and animal hair for use in the manufacture of press cloth, camel's hair belting, knit or felt boots, heavy-fulled lumbermen's socks, rugs, carpets, or any other

floor coverings. The imports for which such free entry is provided are those which, if employed for other end uses than those specified, are dutiable under paragraph 1101 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930. The amendment that would be made by your committee's bill would permit the duty-free importation under bond of wools of whatever blood or origin not finer than 46s and hair provided for in paragraph 1102 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, with a proviso that a tolerance of not more than 10 percent of wools not finer than 48s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 46s. The proviso set forth in the bill is in general accord with present tolerance provisions where fineness of imported wools is relevant to their classification for customs purposes.

In considering this legislation the Committee on Ways and Means was informed that the bill would be of particular benefit to the domestic carpet industry. Unimproved wools, on account of springiness and resilience of some or all of their fibers, provide a more satisfactory and longer wearing nap on carpets and rugs than improved wools. There is very little domestic production of unimproved wools and none of camel's hair. Such domestic production of unimproved wools as does exist in the United States is largely done on Indian reservations for the making of Indian blankets and other handicraft products.

The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that within the 3-year suspension period provided by the bill there is little likelihood of the development of a domestic-wool industry that would produce grades of wool suitable for use in the manufacture of carpets. The United States carpet industry has been largely dependent upon imported wools for use in domestic-carpet production. Some of the countries that have been important producers of unimproved wools have taken measures to restrict their wool exports with a view to conserving the supplies for their domestic industries. In addition, the disruption of United States trade with Communist China—formerly an important source of our imports of unimproved wools—has considerably restricted the supplies of such wools available to domestic manufacturers of carpets. In the absence of a removal of the duty on carpet-grade wools as provided for in H. R. 12227, foreign carpet manufacturers will continue to enjoy an advantage over domestic carpet producers with the result that the United States consumption of carpets will substantially be carpets of foreign manufacture. By making the raw materials more economically available to the domestic carpet industry, we will be improving the competitive position of such industry in the domestic market and assuring the utilization of American labor in the production of such carpets.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury reported favorably to your committee on H. R. 12227.

In approving this legislation, one substantive amendment and certain necessary clerical and technical amend-

ments were adopted. The legislation, as introduced, would have made permanent the provision of the free entry of the wools and hairs covered by the bill. The Committee on Ways and Means adopted an amendment to provide for a suspension of the applicable duty for a period of 3 years so that at the end of the period the Congress could undertake to review the experience with the suspension and determine appropriate legislative action with respect to the future.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in approving H. R. 12227, as amended.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, in the first place because it is premature. There have been no public hearings held on the bill. In fact, it was changed just recently to include up to grade 46 wool instead of 48. Our wool producers heard that the grade of fineness was to be extended from 40 to 48. They are very much opposed and alarmed because of that misconception. If further hearings had been held they might have been more reconciled to it when they learned that the bill had been amended to include only grade 46.

In the second place, I am opposed to the bill because foreign wool could displace from 2 to 5 percent of our coarser domestic wools. I learned, too, that on our desert lands and through the increased production of the mutton type of sheep, we are producing more of these rough wools which can go into carpets. So I do not think we should displace this local production with imported wools.

In the third place, grade 46 wool is usable for overcoats and rough apparel. If we take away the tariff on this type of wool for carpets, then the apparel people are justified in coming in to ask that we take away the tariff on their wool. If we say "No," then we are inconsistent; if we say "Yes," then we have ruined our sheep industry. Furthermore, the bill permits 10 percent grade 48 wool which constitutes a large part of our domestic production.

In the third place, it will increase our taxes because the Government will just have to buy more wool under these incentive payment features rather than move it into consumption.

In the fourth place, it is contrary to Federal policy because our law now gives our woolgrowers an incentive for producing more wool. The reason they give our woolgrowers an incentive is, first, since 1942 the number of sheep in the United States has dropped about 45 percent, from about 49 million head to 27 million head. Second, because we have found no substitute for warmth for our wool in wearing apparel. The next wars will definitely be fought in cold countries, and our country must have warm apparel for our military. This wool is an absolute necessity for the safety of our country, and that is why the Gov-

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11833

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-
4 ment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting “(a)”
5 after the period following “SEC. 16,” and (b) by adding the
6 following subsection:

7 . “(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

8 “(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the
9 amounts of such appropriations as may be provided
10 therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten

1 years with producers in the Great Plains area deter-
2 mined by him to have control for the contract period of
3 the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts
4 shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to
5 make, in orderly progression over a period of years,
6 changes in their cropping systems and land uses which
7 are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of
8 their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water
9 conservation measures needed under such changed sys-
10 tems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during
11 the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on
12 farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of
13 the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska,
14 New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota,
15 Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as
16 susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil
17 types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The pro-
18 ducer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming
19 operations which incorporates such soil and water con-
20 servation practices and principles as may be determined
21 by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of
22 climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located,
23 and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in
24 cropping systems and land use and of the conservation
25 measures which are to be carried out on the farm or

1 ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or
2 ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes.

3 Under the contract the producer shall agree—

4 “(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or
5 ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule
6 outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is
7 waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to
8 paragraph (3) of this subsection;

9 “(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments
10 or grants under the contract and refund to the
11 United States all payments or grants received there-
12 under upon his violation of the contract at any
13 stage during the time he has control of the farm
14 if the Secretary determines that such violation is
15 of such a nature as to warrant termination of the
16 contract, or to make refunds or accept such pay-
17 ment adjustments as the Secretary may deem ap-
18 propriate if he determines that the producer's vio-
19 lation does not warrant termination of the contract;

20 “(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest
21 in the farm or ranch during the contract period to
22 forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under
23 the contract and refund to the United States all
24 payments or grants received thereunder unless the

1 transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the
 2 Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;
 3 “(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by
 4 the Secretary in the contract as a practice which
 5 would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;
 6 “(v) to such additional provisions as the Sec-
 7 retary determines are desirable and includes in the
 8 contract to effectuate the purposes of the program
 9 or to facilitate the practical administration of the
 10 program.

11 In return for such agreement by the producer the Secre-
 12 tary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those
 13 conservation practices set forth in the contract for which
 14 he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in
 15 the public interest. The portion of such cost (including
 16 labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary
 17 determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the
 18 physical installation of the conservation measures under
 19 the contract;

20 “(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract
 21 with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer
 22 if the Secretary determines that such termination would
 23 be in the public interest, and may agree to such modifica-
 24 tion of contracts previously entered into as he may deter-

mine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

“(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

“(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

“(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of

1 wheat under the program carried out under this sub-
2 section shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

3 “(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical serv-
4 ices of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in
5 determining the scope and provisions of any plan and
6 the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes
7 of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take
8 into consideration programs of State and local agencies,
9 including soil conservation districts, having for their
10 purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water
11 conservation;

12 “(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be neces-
14 sary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the
15 total cost of the program (excluding administrative
16 costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any
17 program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000.
18 The funds made available for the program under this
19 subsection may be expended without regard to the maxi-
20 mum payment limitation and small payment increases
21 required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be
22 distributed among States without regard to distribution
23 of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program
24 authorized under this subsection shall be in addition

1 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such
2 area authorized by this or any other Act.”

3 SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
4 of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with
5 the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as fol-
6 lows:

7 “(g) If the county committee determines that any pro-
8 ducer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain
9 in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather
10 conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county
11 committee not later than December 1 in any area where only
12 winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area
13 (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are
14 grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat al-
15 lotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather
16 conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year
17 shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of estab-
18 lishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments:
19 *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduc-
20 tion in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by
21 reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment
22 pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-
23 seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of
24 producing less than the normal production of the farm

1 wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this
2 Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm
3 with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acre-
4 age allotment was established.”

Passed the House of Representatives July 23, 1956.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

July 26, 1956
July 25, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 128

CONTENTS

Accounting.....2	Foreign affairs.....19	Procurement contracts...12
Advisory committees....33	Foreign aid.....27	Property.....37
Appropriations.....1,53	Forestry.....32,46,49	Reclamation.....15,43
ASC Committee.....14	Grain.....16	Research.....16
Atomic energy.....55	Great Plains.....7,23	Retirement.....21
Bonding.....31	Guam.....34	Roads.....42
Budgeting.....2	Guar seed.....6,23	Safety.....8,58
CCC.....38	Housing.....10,17,28	School construction....36
Commodity exchange....48	Imports.....20,39	Security.....31,58
Cranberries.....45	Irrigation.....59	Seeds.....6,23,34
Customs.....5	Labor, farm.....4,17	Small business.....60
Depressed areas.....12	Lands.....35	Soil conservation..7,33,47
Education.....36	Legislative program..23,45	Surplus commodities....26
Electrification.....43	Loans, farm.....17,24	Textiles.....39
Executive pay.....21	Marketing.....45	Trade, foreign.....26
Expenditures.....3	Military construction...10	Transportation.....4,22
Farm program.....44	Minerals.....45	Trip leasing.....4
Farm units.....15	Mining.....40	Veterans' benefits.....11
Fisheries.....18	Monopolies.....56	Water.....33,51
Flood control.....9,50,57	Personnel...21,31,52,54,58	Watersheds.....25
Flood insurance.....30	Postal service.....41	Wheat.....29
Food bank.....13		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses cleared for Presidential action the following bills: Farm loan bill; Watershed bill; amendments to Public Law 480 bill. House received conference report on mutual security appropriation bill. House passed: housing bill; wheat agreement extension bill and flood insurance bill. Conferees agreed to file report on executive pay and retirement bill. House committee issued reports on Federal timber sales policies and CCC purchase-resale transactions. House committee reported bills to permit national forests receipts paid to States to be used for other than schools and roads, and to authorize USDA to pay expenses of soil and water conservation advisory committee. Rep. Rogers, Fla., introduced bill for appropriations on accrued expenditure basis. Senate committee reported Great Plains bill. Senate committee reported bill to reorganize Federal safety functions. Senate cleared following bills for President: improve budgeting and accounting methods; (Continued on page 8)

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendment H. R. 12350, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1957. pp. 13258, 13265, 13275, 13284) Conferees were appointed. (For items of interest to this Department, see Digest 127.)

Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12138, the first supplemental appropriation bill for 1957. (p. 13286) This bill will now be sent to the President.

July 25, 1956

2. BUDGETING; ACCOUNTING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 3897, to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures. (The House agreed to the report on July 23.) This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13078
3. EXPENDITURES. The Jt. Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures submitted a report, "Unexpended Balances, Domestic-Civilian Agencies" (S. Rept. 2803). p. 13070
4. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to the House amendments to S. 898, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the ICC to regulate the use by motor carriers of motor vehicles not owned by them (so-called trip leasing bill). This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13114
Agreed to the House amendments to S. 3391, to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13110
5. CUSTOMS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6040, the customs simplification bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13293
6. SEED. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9396, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list (S. Rept. 2779). p. 13069
7. SOIL CONSERVATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11833, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program (S. Rept. 2785). p. 13069
8. SAFETY. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment S. 3517, to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government (S. Rept. 2788). p. 13070
9. FLOOD CONTROL. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12080, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control (S. Rept. 2784) (p. 13070). Agreed to consider the measure today under limited debate rule (p. 13265).
10. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12270, to authorize certain construction at military installations (S. Rept. 2775) (authorizes the use of Public Law 480 and CCC funds for foreign housing construction for military). p. 13070
11. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Sen. Neuberger inserted and commented on a newspaper article discussing the expiration of the "GI Bill of Rights". p. 13083
12. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Debated, under limited debate rule, S. 2663, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas (pp. 13108, 13310). Agreed to amendments by Sen. Fulbright to increase from \$50 million to \$100 million the amount of loan funds available for rural areas; to eliminate the provision in the bill limiting to 300 counties in the U. S. and 15 in any single State which would be available for assistance under the rural development program (there would be no limitation as provided by the amendment); to increase the limitation to \$6 million which can be loaned in each State under the rural development program; and to strike

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 11833]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill would implement the Great Plains program proposed by the President on January 11, by—

(1) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 10 year contracts with farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains area providing for changes in land use and other measures for soil and water conservation, and

(2) permitting wheat acreage to be counted as planted for the purpose of computing future allotments where unfavorable weather conditions prevent planting and the producer gives appropriate notice of that fact.

The report of the House Committee on Agriculture explaining the bill is attached.

[H. Rept. No. 2640, 84th Cong., 2d sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to implement the program for rehabilitation of the agriculture of the Great Plains by authorizing contracts

of not to exceed 10 years between the Secretary of Agriculture and farmers and ranchers of the area under which the farming operations of the area will progressively be established on a soil- and water-conservation basis with substantial assistance from the Federal Government. The bill authorizes appropriations of not to exceed \$150 million for carrying out the program with the restriction that payments for any years shall not exceed \$25 million.

Enactment of the legislation was recommended by the Department of Agriculture in an executive communication dated May 24, 1956, copy of which appears below. Pursuant to the executive communication bills were introduced by Mr. Cooley, of North Carolina, the committee chairman (H. R. 11831), and by Mr. Hope, of Kansas (H. R. 11833). Hearings were held jointly on the two bills and witnesses from the Department of Agriculture and the major farm organizations appeared in support thereof. There were no witnesses opposed to the bill.

Following consideration of the bills in executive session, Mr. Cooley moved that the bill introduced by Mr. Hope (H. R. 11833) be reported.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The provisions of the bill will apply to farms and ranches in counties designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion in the following 10 States: Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. Within the designated area the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to make contracts of not to exceed 10 years with agricultural producers for the gradual adoption in an orderly manner of changes in their cropping systems and land use which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and the area generally. The termination date of such contracts shall be not later than December 31, 1971.

Each contract will be based upon a plan of farming operations and a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use designed to bring into operation desirable conservation practices and adapt the farming operations to a system best designed to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. In the contract the producer will agree to carry out the program in accordance with the plan and schedule agreed upon, and not to adopt any practice specified as tending to defeat the purpose of the contract; and to forfeit all rights to further payments, and refund to the United States all payments or grants received under the contract, upon a substantial violation thereof or upon transfer of the producer's right and interest in the farm or ranch, unless the transferee agrees to assume the obligations of the contract.

In return for such agreement by the producer, the Secretary will agree to share the cost of carrying out the conservation practices set forth in the contract. Evidence presented to the committee was that the proposed Government share of the cost will average approximately 80 percent. The bill also provides, under circumstances detailed in the Department's letter, for preserving farm history of allotted crops during the transition period.

The bill authorizes to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation a maximum of \$150 million for the entire program, exclusive of admin-

istrative costs, but provides that not to exceed \$25 million of such funds may be expended on the program in any one year. The special program authorized in the bill is to be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in the area, such as the ACP program, the Soil Conservation Service program, or the soil bank.

VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

It is the specific understanding and intention of the committee in reporting favorably on this legislation that the program herein authorized is to be completely voluntary and that no pressure or coercion of any kind is to be exercised on farmers and ranchers in order to persuade them to enter into this program. Spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture assured the committee unequivocally that the program would be carried out on an entirely voluntary basis.

By a "voluntary basis" the committee means that the farmer or rancher shall not only be free to enter into or not to enter into the contracts authorized by this act but that no pressure shall be put on him, either directly or indirectly, by the Department of Agriculture in order to influence his decision. Participation in the program herein authorized is not to be made a consideration in the granting of FHA loans or extending any other type of agricultural credit, in the making of acreage allotments, nor in the administration of any other program of the Department of Agriculture.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Following is the executive communication from the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this legislation and explaining the application of the proposed program.

MAY 24, 1956.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under date of January 11, 1956, the President submitted to you a program for the Great Plains. In conformity with this message we are transmitting proposed amendments to section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which are designed to assist in accomplishing the purpose indicated by President Eisenhower in his message. I recommend passage of these amendments.

The purpose of these amendments is to round out and make available a sounder and more workable approach to Federal cost sharing in meeting the conservation problems on individual farms and ranches of the Great Plains. They would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce a conservation program for that area and to enter into 10-year contracts with farm and ranch operators to terminate not later than December 31, 1971. Under these contracts producers would agree to a schedule of land-use adjustment and the necessary conservation measures which should be carried out in connection with such shift. The contract would provide for the carrying out in orderly progression over a period of years changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources on their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed

systems and uses. The Secretary would agree to provide cost sharing for the carrying out of specified conservation measures which are a necessary part of the land-use adjustment.

The proposed program would differ from the regular ACP in that the contract would assure the necessary cost-sharing assistance over a period of years long enough to complete the land-use adjustment. The contract would require the producer to render satisfactory performance in making the land-use adjustment and the application of the needed conservation measures.

The proposed program would differ from the soil-bank program in that it is aimed at obtaining a shift in land use rather than a reduction in production. It is designed to encourage a permanent shift in land use in the Great Plains taking into consideration the conditions which are peculiar to that area. The contract would give the producer assurance of the cost-sharing assistance needed to complete the conservation work in an orderly progression. No annual or rental-type payment is provided under this program but the producer would be permitted to utilize for grazing purposes the land established in vegetative cover under the contract, consistent with good range management. Cost-sharing assistance under this program would be available for conservation measures on land being shifted and also on other land on the farm if the conservation measures are a necessary part of the land-use adjustment.

In the Great Plains area there are about 12½ million acres of cropland estimated to be unsuited for continuous crop production and which should be devoted to permanent vegetative cover. Of this amount we estimated that about 10 million acres would be on farms and ranches which are potential cooperators under this program which would require about \$112 million of cost-sharing assistance. (This is based on 80 percent of the estimated acreage cost of \$14 per acre.) In addition to seeding this area, certain range practices, such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed.

In this area it is estimated that there are about 200 million acres of privately owned range and noncrop pastureland. Due to continued drought and concurrent damages from wind erosion, a relatively small acreage has become so badly depleted as to need range restoration measures. It is estimated that about 6 million acres of this land will need to be reseeded at a total cost of \$30 million (based on 80 percent of the estimated total cost of \$6.25 per acre), in order to bring it back to normal productive capacity. In addition to seeding this area certain range practices, such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed. It is estimated that the corollary measures to be installed on cropland and rangeland would involve the Federal expenditure of about \$8 million. Thus the total cost of the program proposed herein would be about \$150 million.

It is estimated that total payments for any one program year will not be in excess of \$25 million.

Since neither the Department nor the farm and ranch operators in the area have had any experience in this longtime "contract" approach, it is extremely difficult to make accurate estimates of the extent of participation or of the cost of administration. We have, therefore, attempted to keep our estimates on the conservative side. They may later need to be revised if experience dictates.

The authority requested in these amendments is predicated on a continuation of the ACP as presently authorized and the enactment

of the soil-bank program as submitted. Otherwise this proposal would need to be revised in order to adequately meet the problems in the Great Plains area.

This proposal provides that in instances where any wheat producer is unable to seed his full wheat allotment due to unfavorable weather, he may, by notifying the county committee prior to December 1 where only winter wheat is produced or prior to June 1 in the spring wheat area, including those areas where both spring and winter wheat are grown, request that credit be given for seeding his full acreage allotment. If the county committee determines that the full allotment was not seeded because of the unfavorable weather, then the wheat allotment established for such farm will be considered as the planted acreage of wheat in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

Regulations issued by the Secretary for each of the past several years provide for relief to farmers who are prevented from seeding because of unfavorable weather. This bill would provide legislative assurance to farmers of such adjustments instead of their having to rely on regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In addition, the bill would allow for the maintenance of wheat history on farms where no wheat is produced due to unfavorable weather, which would insure that any farm for which an allotment was established would retain its "old farm" status for any future wheat allotment program. Under existing law a farm on which no wheat is seeded during the preceding 3 years must be considered as a "new" wheat farm.

A producer could not claim the above privilege if he desired to obtain a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat through underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment or through producing less than the normal production of the farm acreage allotment.

Many producers maintain that present legislation encourages farmers to plant their full wheat acreage allotment each year in order to preserve their historical acreage. Under the proposed amendment farmers would in effect be excused from planting if unfavorable weather conditions prevailed at the time of their normal seeding season.

The proposed legislation has also been sent to the President of the Senate.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in *roman*):

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

* * * * * *

SEC. 16. (a) The obligations incurred for the purpose of carrying out, for any calendar year, the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this Act shall not exceed \$500,000,000.

(b) *Notwithstanding any other provision of law—*

(1) *the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—*

(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including Soil Conservation Districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: Provided, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

* * * * *

SEC. 334. * * *

(g) *If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: Provided, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established.*

○

Calendar No. 2839

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11833

[Report No. 2785]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, without amendment

AN ACT

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-
4 ment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting “(a)”
5 after the period following “SEC. 16,” and (b) by adding the
6 following subsection:

7 “(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

8 “(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the
9 amounts of such appropriations as may be provided
10 therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten

1 years with producers in the Great Plains area deter-
2 mined by him to have control for the contract period of
3 the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts
4 shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to
5 make, in orderly progression over a period of years,
6 changes in their cropping systems and land uses which
7 are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of
8 their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water
9 conservation measures needed under such changed sys-
10 tems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during
11 period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on
12 farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of
13 the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska,
14 New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota,
15 Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as
16 susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil
17 types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The pro-
18 ducer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming
19 operations which incorporates such soil and water con-
20 servation practices and principles as may be determined
21 by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of
22 climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located,
23 and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in
24 cropping systems and land use and of the conservation
25 measures which are to be carried out on the farm or

1 ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or
2 ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes.

3 Under the contract the producer shall agree—

4 “(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or
5 ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule
6 outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is
7 waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to
8 paragraph (3) of this subsection;

9 “(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments
10 or grants under the contract and refund to the
11 United States all payments or grants received there-
12 under upon his violation of the contract at any
13 stage during the time he has control of the farm
14 if the Secretary determines that such violation is
15 of such a nature as to warrant termination of the
16 contract, or to make refunds or accept such pay-
17 ment adjustments as the Secretary may deem ap-
18 propriate if he determines that the producer’s vio-
19 lation does not warrant termination of the contract;

20 “(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest
21 in the farm or ranch during the contract period to
22 forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under
23 the contract and refund to the United States all
24 payments or grants received thereunder unless the

1 transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the
2 Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

3 “(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by
4 the Secretary in the contract as a practice which
5 would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

6 “(v) to such additional provisions as the Secre-
7 tary determines are desirable and includes in the
8 contract to effectuate the purposes of the program
9 or to facilitate the practical administration of the
10 program.

11 In return for such agreement by the producer the Secre-
12 tary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those
13 conservation practices set forth in the contract for which
14 he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in
15 the public interest. The portion of such cost (including
16 labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary
17 determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the
18 physical installation of the conservation measures under
19 the contract;

20 “(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract
21 with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer
22 if the Secretary determines that such termination would
23 be in the public interest, and may agree to such modifica-
24 tion of contracts previously entered into as he may deter-

1 mine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the
2 program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

3 “(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any
4 farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments
5 and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment
6 Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the
7 farm shall not be decreased during the period of any
8 contract entered into under this subsection by reason
9 of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out
10 such contract;

11 “(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined
12 under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted
13 from the production of any commodity subject to acreage
14 allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the
15 contract entered into under the program shall be con-
16 sidered acreage devoted to the commodity for the pur-
17 poses of establishing future State, county, and farm
18 acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment
19 Act of 1938, as amended;

20 “(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6)
21 of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C.
22 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount
23 of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of

1 wheat under the program carried out under this sub-
2 section shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

3 “(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical serv-
4 ices of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in
5 determining the scope and provisions of any plan and
6 the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes
7 of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take
8 into consideration programs of State and local agencies,
9 including soil conservation districts, having for their
10 purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water
11 conservation;

12 “(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be neces-
14 sary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the
15 total cost of the program (excluding administrative
16 costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any
17 program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000.
18 The funds made available for the program under this
19 subsection may be expended without regard to the maxi-
20 mum payment limitation and small payment increases
21 required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be
22 distributed among States without regard to distribution
23 of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program
24 authorized under this subsection shall be in addition

1 to, and not in substitution of, other programs in such
2 area authorized by this or any other Act."

3 SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
4 of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with
5 the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as fol-
6 lows:

7 " (g) If the county committee determines that any pro-
8 ducer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain
9 in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather
10 conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county
11 committee not later than December 1 in any area where only
12 winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area
13 (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are
14 grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat al-
15 lotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather
16 conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year
17 shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of estab-
18 lishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments:
19 *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduc-
20 tion in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by
21 reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment
22 pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-
23 seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of
24 producing less than the normal production of the farm

1 wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this
 2 Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm
 3 with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acre-
 4 age allotment was established.”

Passed the House of Representatives July 23, 1956.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 2839

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11833

[Report No. 2785]

AN ACT

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 25 (legislative day, JULY 16), 1956

Reported without amendment

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

July 27, 1956
July 26, 1956
84th-2nd, No. 129

CONTENTS

Accounting.....52	Forestry.....33,51	Point-of-order.....1
Acreage allotments.....46	Freight rates.....17	Reclamation.....20,39
Advisory committee.....28	Fruitfly.....12	Records.....40
Appropriations...1,3,12,26	Grain storage.....2	Research.....16,26
Atomic energy.....41	Great Plains.....6	Retirement.....32
Civil defense.....54	Guar seed.....13	Security.....50
Contracts.....15	Insects.....12	Seeds.....13
Cranberries.....29	Labor, farm.....11	Social security.....27
Crop insurance.....25	standards.....42	Soil bank.....35,48
Depressed areas.....4	Lands.....7,34,49	Soil conservation.....6,28
Electrification.....18,39	Leases.....15	Surplus commodities..26,30
Executive pay.....32	Legislative program....23	Tariff.....13,14
Fisheries.....23,31	Marketing.....29	Taxation.....2
Flood control.....9,36	Military construction..30	Transportation.....17,43
Flood insurance.....5,37	Natural resources.....8	Travel.....32
Food sterilization.....41	Paperwork.....44	Veterans' benefits.....19
Foreign affairs.....22	Patents.....21	Water.....20,28,38
Foreign aid.....24	Perishable commodities..10	Watersheds.....34
Forest Service.....41	Personnel.....32,47,53	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both houses adopted conference report on executive pay and retirement bill. House agreed to conference report on mutual security appropriation bill. House passed bill to provide for travel and transportation cost allowance for new appointees. House passed bill to authorize FCIC reinsurance in Puerto Rico. House agreed to conference report on second supplemental appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on bill amending Social Security Act. House passed bill authorizing USDA to pay expenses of soil and water conservation advisory committee. House passed cranberries for canning and freezing marketing bill. House agreed to Senate amendments to military construction bill. House agreed to conference report on fisheries bill. Senate committee reported point-of-order bill. Senate passed, and cleared for President, Great Plains bill. Senate rejected conference report on second supplemental appropriation bill. Senate passed area redevelopment bill. Senate disagreed to House amendment to flood insurance bill. Senate passed grain-storage amortization bill. Senate agreed to resolution favoring water resource development.

SENATE

1. POINT-OF-ORDER BILL. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported this bill (H. R. 11682) without amendment (S. Rept. 2811). p. 13358
2. GRAIN STORAGE; TAXATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 9083, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities. Conferees were appointed. pp. 13393, 13395

3. APPROPRIATIONS. At the request of Sen. Hayden and without debate, rejected the conference report on H. R. 12350, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1957. Conferees were appointed for a further conference. p. 13450
4. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Passed, by a vote of 60 to 30, with amendments S. 2663, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas. pp. 13352, 13363
5. FLOOD INSURANCE. Disagreed to an amendment by the House to S. 3732, to provide for an insurance program against flood damage. Conferees were appointed. p. 13383
6. SOIL CONSERVATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 11833, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for a Great Plains conservation program. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13408
7. LANDS. Passed with amendment S. 3957, to amend the act authorizing the exchange and amendment of certain farm units in order to limit the time during which applications may be made. p. 13416
8. NATURAL RESOURCES. Agreed to, as reported, S. Res. 281, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding executive policy in connection with water resources development, etc. p. 13418
Sen. Goldwater inserted and discussed an article relative to the natural resource policies of the Administration. p. 13326
Sen. Goldwater defended the natural resource policies of the Interior Department. p. 13327
9. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed with amendment H. R. 12080, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and other purposes. Conferees were appointed. pp. 13328, 13340
10. PERISHABLE COMMODITIES. Sen. Magnuson inserted his statement concerning the shipments of certain perishable and other commodities in interstate commerce. p. 13365
11. FARM LABOR. Considered, but took no action on, H. R. 6888, providing for the admission into the U. S. of certain aliens skilled in sheepherding. p. 13351
12. INSECTS. Sen. Holland inserted a telegram from the Governor of Fla., announcing the appropriation of \$5 million by the State to match the Federal appropriation for the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication program. p. 13381
13. SEEDS. Passed with amendment H. R. 9396, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list. p. 13390
14. TARIFF SCHEDULES. Passed without amendment H. R. 12254, to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13392
15. LEASES; CONTRACTS. Concurred in a House amendment to S. 4058, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to a railroad company for 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the USDA Range Livestock Experiment Station, in Montana. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13402

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

TITLE I. EXECUTIVE PAY

Title I of the conference substitute establishes salary levels for Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and other executives of the Federal Government generally conforming to the salary levels for such officials provided by the bill as passed by the House. The salary levels for Cabinet officers, \$25,000, for the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General, \$22,500, and for the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, \$22,000, are the same as in the House bill.

Principal differences in the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House are: First, chairmen of major boards and commissions are in salary level \$20,500 under the conference substitute, compared to levels of \$19,500 and \$20,000 in the House bill, and, second, assistant secretaries of executive and military departments, including Assistant Postmasters General, administrators of certain bureaus and agencies, and members of major boards and commissions are placed in the \$20,000 salary level under the conference substitute, compared to a salary level of \$19,000 in the House bill. The salaries of governors of Territories and possessions are placed at \$19,000 under the conference substitute.

The conference substitute establishes a proper alinement between salaries of Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and the heads of the various agencies, independent establishments, and bureaus in accordance with the level of the duties and responsibilities of such positions.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of specified numbers of administrative assistants and other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office. The conferees on the part of the House agreed to the total number of such positions as contained in the Senate amendment, including 3 positions, 2 for the assistants to the deputy assistants to the President and 1 secretary to the Cabinet.

In accordance with the bill as passed by the House, the conference substitute increases the maximum salaries under the Classification Act of 1949, grade GS-18, and under the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, salary level 20, from \$14,800 to \$16,000, with appropriate adjustments in salary steps for the immediate lower grade and levels provided in those acts. Maximum salaries for chief medical officers and assistants in the Veterans' Administration are increased, under the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House, to maintain the existing relationship between such salaries and the salaries of other Government officials and of classified and postal field service positions.

TITLE II. TERMS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS AND SUCCESSION TO DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

Title II of the conference substitute establishes 6-year, staggered terms of office for United States Civil Service Commissioners; provides for designation by

the President of a vice chairman of the commission; and provides a line of succession to perform the duties and responsibilities of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission by the vice chairman, in the absence of the chairman, and by the other member of the commission in the absence of the chairman and vice chairman.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title III of the conference substitute provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of general counsels of the Post Office Department, a general counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to replace the existing offices of the chief legal officers of such Departments, which will be abolished.

The Senate amendment authorized the director of the administrative office of the United States courts to place a total of 4 positions in grade GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and provided that the positions of 7 directors of commodity offices, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS-16 of such schedule. The conference substitute does not contain such provisions, but increases by 11 positions the total number of supergrade positions which a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to place in appropriate grades of the general schedule. It should be clearly understood by the Civil Service Commission that it should give immediate consideration with respect to an immediate adjustment in the classification of these positions.

Three positions allocated by the Senate bill in grade 18 for Deputy Administrators for the Agricultural Research Service are contained in the conference substitute.

TITLE IV. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The conference substitute contains a complete revision of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The House bill contained no such provision.

The conference substitute greatly liberalizes retirement benefits of Federal employees. The cost to the Government of the added benefits is estimated at \$310 million a year. The major new employee benefits provided by the conference substitute are:

Annuities will be computed at (a) 2 percent of the high average salary multiplied by all years of service in excess of 10 plus 1½ percent of such salary multiplied by the first 5 years of service, plus 1¾ percent of the years of service from 5 to 10, or (b) 1 percent of high average salary, plus \$25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater. Under present law annuities are computed on the basis of 1½ percent of high average salary, or 1 percent of such salary plus \$25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater.

The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first \$2,400 and 10 percent of the balance. The present reduction is 5 percent of the first \$1,500 and 10 percent of the balance.

Optional retirement is authorized at age 62 after 5 years of service, with the right to elect survivor benefits. Present law provides an annuity after 5 years of service, but requires 15 years of service for election of survivor benefits.

The present right to retire on a reduced annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is continued.

The reduction factor for retirement before reaching age 60 is changed from 3 percent a year to 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under age 55.

Disability benefits are liberalized by providing a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is the lesser.

Retirement is provided for the first time to members who complete at least 20 years service and are at least 50 years of age in cases where they are separated from their positions by other than resignation or expulsion.

An annuity is granted upon involuntary separation after attaining the age of 50 years with 20 years of service, and the existing provision for annuity upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age, is continued.

Upon death of an employee after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee, the surviving widow or widower will receive an annuity equal to 50 percent of the earned annuity of the decedent, beginning the first month after such death.

Survivor annuities of children of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

An annuitant who is reemployed and serves at least 1 full-time year on active duty in a position covered by the Retirement Act will receive an annuity based on his reemployed service as well as his annuity based on the original retirement. Any lump-sum leave credit will not be reduced by reason of annuity paid to him during reemployment.

The contribution on the part of employees and agencies will be 6½ percent per annum and 7½ percent per annum for Members of Congress. The bill that passed the Senate required 7 percent from employees and 8 percent for Members. The bill as reported from the House committee required a contribution of 6 percent from employees and 7 percent from Members. The conference agreement, will, in my estimation, place the system on a fully funded basis.

Members of the civilian faculties of the Naval Academy and naval postgraduate school, and United States commissioners who meet certain tests of minimum compensation and service, are brought into the civil service retirement system.

TITLE V. SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

The conference substitute authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish not more than 120 scientific and professional positions in lieu of 45 now authorized in the Department of Defense and not more than 25 such positions in the Na-

tional Security Agency, to carry out research and development functions relating to national defense and military and naval medicine. It authorizes the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to establish 30 such positions in his agency. A salary range of \$12,500 to \$19,000 is established for such positions by title I of the conference substitute.

I should add that the conferees of both the House and the Senate were unanimous in agreeing to the conference report. The House has already adopted the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2839, H. R. 11833.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill would implement the Great Plains program proposed by the President on January 11, by—

First. Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 10-year contracts with farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains area providing for changes in land use and other measures for soil and water conservation; and

Second. Permitting wheat acreage to be counted as planted for the purpose of computing future allotments where unfavorable weather conditions prevent planting and the producer gives appropriate notice of that fact.

The authority provided by this bill would be in addition to that provided by the present ACP program, the Soil Conservation Service program, and the soil bank. Unlike the soil bank, it is directed toward changing land use rather than reducing production. Unlike the current ACP program, it provides for 10-year contracts, and would not be subject to the maximum payment limitation and small-farm provision of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The purpose of the program is to obtain needed changes in land use to meet the climatic conditions of the area and avert serious wind erosion and resultant economic distress. The program provided for by the first section of the bill would continue only through 1971 and the cost of such program exclusive of administrative costs, would be limited to \$150 million over the entire period and \$25 million in any year.

The provision of the bill permitting wheat acreage to be counted as planted where unfavorable weather conditions prevent planting is similar to section 307 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 which, however, is limited to the period 1956 to 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am very glad the pending bill has come before the Senate and is apparently on its way to becoming law.

On January 9, President Eisenhower sent a special farm message to Congress. In that message he outlined nine points of a program, the enactment of which he believed was highly essential for the welfare of agriculture.

The pending bill represents the last of the nine points to be acted upon during this year. All the points, with one exception have been authorized, and they have been enacted by Congress in about the form in which they were requested by President Eisenhower.

The one exception was not exactly a request, but a suggestion that Congress might wish to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price support loans. Nothing has been done about that. Nearly every other item in the President's message has been acted upon, and acted upon almost in the form in which the President requested it.

I do not believe any President has ever had such an almost complete response to requests made to Congress on behalf of an agricultural program that President Eisenhower has had this year.

I am sure we all appreciate the work of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and of all the other members of the committee, who contributed toward bringing all these requests of the President before Congress for action.

Mr. CARLSON. The legislation proposed by the pending bill is important to the Great Plains area, of which Kansas is a part. I commend the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for bringing this measure before the Senate. I hope we will complete action on it promptly, because it is important to a long-range program. We have been operating our program of soil conservation on an annual basis. I believe we must make plans to carry it out on a several-year basis. On that basis this proposed legislation is very important.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that when this bill is enacted into law, it, together with the legislation which has already been passed, will give sufficient authority to the Department of Agriculture and provide a great deal of incentive to landowners and operators to restore to grass hundreds of thousands of acres which probably should never have been plowed in the first place, except for the fact that the emergency made it necessary to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I merely wish to say that I too believe that

the pending bill is one of the most forward-looking pieces of conservation legislation we could possibly pass. It will surely do a great deal of good in the Great Plains area, of which Kansas is a part, where there has been plowed land which, except for emergency reasons, perhaps should never have been plowed and cultivated.

Being a tie-in with the acreage conservation reserve of the soil bank, I am sure the bill will have a long and enduring effect upon soil fertility and the overall conservation of land resources. I am delighted that the bill has been brought before the Senate, and I wish to commend the chairman of the committee for making it possible for us to vote for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that Senators are remarking on the work of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and of the distinguished ranking minority member of that committee. The Chair will recall that at the beginning of this session the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was divided 8 to 7 on one of the most difficult pieces of legislation which ever has been considered in the Senate since I have been a Member of this body. When the first action was taken by the Congress the President was not in accord with it. There was much chance of friction, but under the able leadership of the chairman of the committee and ranking minority member, and of all other members of the committee, a very constructive program of legislation has been accomplished. I am proud to have been a member of that committee, and I am proud to acknowledge the fine and constructive leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority member of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I merely wish to second, so to speak, the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and I wish to pay a tribute to the Senator from Florida, which I had hoped to do yesterday, with reference to the farm credit legislation which has been reported and acted upon.

As the Senator recalls, we had some differences of opinion, but, finally, when the conference report was presented, many of the details were worked out to our mutual satisfaction. I think the Senate will long remember that the Senator from Florida took care of one of the most important items of farm legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate these cordial remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I remember when we were asked to break up the prairies and raise wheat. We broke up hundreds and thousands of acres which otherwise we would not have broken up. The bill which is about to be passed, Mr. President, will contribute 80 percent toward the reseeding, and terrific benefit will be derived by all the farmers in the Northwest area.

I wish to compliment the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and especially the chairman of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11833) was passed.

Public Law 1021 - 84th Congress
Chapter 1030 - 2d Session
H. R. 11833

AN ACT

To amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended (a) by inserting "(a)" after the period following "SEC. 16," and (b) by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the Secretary is authorized, within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor, to enter into contracts of not to exceed ten years with producers in the Great Plains area determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms or ranches covered thereby. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm and ranch operators to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, changes in their cropping systems and land uses which are needed to conserve the soil and water resources of their farms and ranches and to install the soil and water conservation measures needed under such changed systems and uses. Such contracts shall be in effect during the period ending not later than December 31, 1971, on farms and ranches in counties in the Great Plains area of the States of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, designated by the Secretary as susceptible to serious wind erosion by reason of their soil types, terrain, and climatic and other factors. The producer shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations which incorporates such soil and water conservation practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable for maximum mitigation of climatic hazards of the area in which the farm is located, and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes in cropping systems and land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm or ranch during the contract period to protect the farm or ranch from erosion and deterioration by natural causes. Under the contract the producer shall agree—

Soil Conservation
and Domestic Al-
lotment Act,
amendments.
49 Stat. 1151.
16 USC 590p.
Great Plains
conservation
program.

"(i) to effectuate the plan for his farm or ranch substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirement thereof is waived or modified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (3) of this subsection;

70 Stat. 1115.

"(ii) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm; if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract;

70 Stat. 1116.

"(iii) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm or ranch during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of the farm or ranch agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(iv) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"(v) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

Cost sharing. In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree to share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation measures under the contract;

Termination of contract. "(2) the Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof;

52 Stat. 31.
7 USC 1281.

"(3) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enter into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under this subsection by reason of any action taken for the purpose of carrying out such contract;

"(4) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments or marketing quotas in order to carry out the contract entered into under the program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

55 Stat. 203.

"(5) in applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), relating to the reduction of storage amount of wheat, any acreage diverted from the production of wheat under the program carried out under this subsection shall be regarded as wheat acreage;

70 Stat. 1116.
70 Stat. 1117.

"(6) the Secretary shall utilize the technical services of agencies of the Department of Agriculture in determining the scope and provisions of any plan and the acceptability of the plan for effectuating the purposes of the program. In addition the Secretary shall take into consideration programs of State and local agencies, including soil conservation districts, having for their purposes the objectives of maximum soil and water conservation;

Appropriations.

"(7) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection: *Provided*, That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed \$150,000,000, and for any program year payments shall not exceed \$25,000,000. The funds made available for the program under this subsection may be expended without regard to the maximum payment limitation and small payment increases required under section 8 (e) of this Act, and may be distributed among States without regard to distribution of funds formulas of section 15 of this Act. The program authorized under this subsection shall be in addition to,

16 USC 590h,
590o.

and not in substitution of, other programs in such area authorized by this or any other Act."

SEC. 2. Section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1957 crop of wheat, by adding a new subsection as follows: 7 USC 1334.

"(g) If the county committee determines that any producer is prevented from seeding wheat for harvest as grain in his usual planting season because of unfavorable weather conditions, and the operator of the farm notifies the county committee not later than December 1 in any area where only winter wheat is grown, or June 1 in the spring wheat area (including an area where both spring and winter wheat are grown), that he does not intend to seed his full wheat allotment for the crop year because of the unfavorable weather conditions, the entire farm wheat allotment for such year shall be regarded as wheat acreage for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments: *Provided*, That if any producer on a farm obtains a reduction in the storage amount of any previous crop of wheat by reason of underplanting the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), or by reason of producing less than the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment pursuant to section 326 (b) of this Act, this provision may not be made applicable to such farm with respect to the crop of wheat for which the farm acreage allotment was established." 55 Stat. 203. 7 USC 1326.

Approved August 7, 1956.

